

Like most public works of its size and scope, the canal is justified with a complex and sometimes bewildering battery of figures, estimates, charts, and diagrams.

But for the American taxpayer, the basic question remains:

Why build a \$1.25 billion canal from the Ohio River to Lake Erie?

People have been asking this question since the early 1820's, when the project was first considered. It has been proposed a number of times since.

Each time, it was rejected by various governmental agencies as impractical and economically unsound.

The original argument for the canal, that of linking two major shipping routes, remains the same today, but with a new twist.

Supporters point hopefully to projected benefits that they feel will sweep across the Nation after the Ohio River and Lake Erie are joined.

But they are most enthusiastic over the low-cost transportation the canal would provide to landlocked steel industries in the Youngstown area.

Some 95 percent of the freight that is expected to travel on the canal will be coal and iron ore, the basic raw materials for steel production.

At present, Youngstown area steel industries obtain their raw materials by rail.

Canal boosters maintain water transportation would be less than half the cost of rail rates. At first, the corps predicted that the canal would yield annual transportation savings of \$138,100,000.

Later, higher corps officials slashed this figure to \$68,500,000.

There is no doubt there would be savings for the steel mills in the Youngstown area.

While economic experts hired by the corps admit that the canal would not help the Nation's total steel output, they stress that it would reverse the current decline of the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area in the ranks of the country's major steel manufacturing centers.

In 1950, the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area produced 38.8 percent of the total national steel output.

Since then, it has dropped to 33 percent of the total national production.

Supporters admit that the steel production in the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area has not declined over the years. But it has not grown as rapidly as it has in other areas of the country.

If the canal is not built, corps consulting economists predict that the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area will produce only 15.7 percent of the Nation's total steel production by 2025.

However, if the canal is built, the area will produce 25.7 percent.

Supporters feel that by slowing the area's declining role in American steel production, the existing economic problems in the Youngstown-Pittsburgh district will be reduced.

Surprisingly, while the economic consultants have dealt with the "Youngstown-Pittsburgh area" when speaking of benefits to the economy, Pittsburgh leaders are strongly opposed to the canal.

The Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, in a recent survey of businesses and industries, received a strongly negative response to the project. Included in those industries objecting to the canal were major steel firms.

Pittsburgh area labor leaders and city officials are also opposed to the canal. This opposition is echoed all the way to the State House in Harrisburg.

In fact, canal supporters find it difficult to obtain any backing in Pennsylvania.

Senator HUGH SCOTT seemingly summed up his State's opposition when he said, "The canal would make it cheaper to manufacture

steel in Youngstown, but only because the taxpayers would pay for the transportation."

SCOTT continued: "Even this benefit would be offset by losses of steel production and employment in the steelworks of the Pittsburgh district, the upper Ohio Valley, Johnstown, eastern Pennsylvania, and probably even Buffalo and Chicago."

While Pennsylvania leaders are obviously worried about the canal's effect on their economy, the leaders of 19 major railroads are even more fearful.

The Upper Ohio Valley Association, an organization formed by the railroads to oppose the canal, predicts that the canal would indeed result in transportation savings for the steel industry, but at a staggering cost to railroad employment and revenue.

Labeling the project a "planned disaster," the rails warn that more than 7,500 workers in 10 States will lose their jobs if the canal is built.

Ohio railroads claim that 3,679 workers will be laid off if the project goes through. This, they say, will result in an annual payroll loss of \$26,888,263.

In recommending construction of the canal the Corps of Engineers discounted recommendations of the Arthur D. Little, Inc., economic consultants hired by the engineers to determine the economic effects of the canal.

While the corps used much of the economic and transportation data obtained by the consulting economics firm, it used few of its conclusions.

A corps spokesman explained: "These, we felt, were the Little firm's opinions. Based on data our people obtained, we felt their opinions were incorrect."

Nevertheless, the corps paid the Little firm \$75,000 for the study and its conclusions.

These conclusions were:

The canal would force the railroads to lower their rates, but the rails would continue to carry most of the freight.

The canal would not create new, diversified industry in the area.

Steel prices would not be reduced.

Total U.S. steel output would not be increased.

Area coal production would not be affected. The canal would have little effect on the region's total economy—aside from the \$1.25 billion that would be spent to build it.

The corps objected most strongly to the Little Co.'s information concerning projected rates.

After the economists presented their report, the corps undertook its own study and produced new projected rates that indicated the rails could not compete with the barges.

The railroads registered sharp protests over the corps' new figures. They felt they did not reflect technological advancements currently being made and planned for by the rails.

Further, the railroads charged that the corps figured the lowest possible barge rates and the highest possible rail rates to produce their net savings figures.

In June of this year, the Council of Lake Erie Ports issued a sharply critical statement on the corps' canal proposal and its figures.

The council, composed of representatives from the 14 major ports on Lake Erie, charged, "the report contains so many imponderables and omissions that authorization should not be considered until a more comprehensive study can be made."

Like the railroads, the Council of Lake Erie Ports felt the corps had used "unrealistic figures," which showed rail rates at their worst and barge rates at their best.

The corps insists, however, that its projected barge rates would produce an average annual savings of \$68,500,000.

These savings alone would barely justify

the cost of a \$1.25 billion canal, the corps admits.

But the corps felt that the project would provide additional benefits besides the transportation savings.

They listed benefits obtained for the proposed recreational facilities at the Grand River Reservoir.

The huge, manmade lake would supply the northern end of the canal with water pumped from Lake Erie.

It would also serve as a vast recreational center with 34,350 acres set aside around the reservoir for hunting, fishing, swimming, boating, and camping areas.

The corps determined that the benefits that would be obtained from recreation at the Grand River Reservoir were worth \$21,500,000 a year.

Further, the corps valued the wildlife benefits from the reservoir at \$1,281,000.

And finally, the corps placed a value of \$2,750,000 annually on flood control benefits from the reservoir and the canal.

This brought the total annual benefits to \$94,100,000.

The engineers figured the total annual costs of the canal at \$55,800,000.

Using these figures, the corps gave the project a cost-benefit ratio of 1.7 * * * or a return of \$1.70 for each dollar spent on the canal.

Canal opponents, however, charged that the corps' cost-benefit ratio was completely false.

First, they said, the corps left out the costs of a major harbor at the Lake Erie end of the canal.

Also, they noted the corps failed to include the costs of terminal facilities along the canal at various plants and cities.

These costs, the opponents said, would be more than \$150 million.

These facilities would be paid for by local interests * * * which could be anything from the State of Ohio, to private companies.

Opponents also echoed a criticism of the project which was originally made by the 1955 Hoover Commission in a study of a previous Lake Erie-Ohio River canal proposal.

The Commission slapped the previous canal plan for failing to consider the economic losses that the canal would create in the railroad and trucking industries and existing Lake Erie ports.

The railroads, using the Corps' projected canal tonnages, claim they will suffer a gross revenue loss of \$225 million a year.

The railroads' hardest hit by the canal would be the Baltimore & Ohio, the Chesapeake & Ohio, the Norfolk & Western, the Pennsylvania, and the New York Central.

Lake Erie port operators also are fearful of severe economic damages that they feel would be inflicted by the canal.

As indicated in the corps' report, some 95 percent of the freight carried on the canal would be coal and iron ore.

At present most of the material handled by the major Ohio lake ports is coal and iron ore.

Lake ports in Toledo, Ashtabula, Sandusky, Cleveland, Huron and Lorain would lose large amounts of freight according to figures listed in the corps report.

The corps did not place an economic value on the hardships that the canal would create for the railroads, or existing lake ports.

Nor did the corps give a value to the effect the canal would have on Cleveland.

Cleveland civic and industrial leaders have been sharply opposed to the project. Their opposition stems from two pages in the economics phase of the overall canal report.

These pages show that if the canal is built, the Cleveland-Detroit area steel industry will suffer badly.

At present, the mills in the Cleveland-Detroit area produce 10.6 percent of the

August 26, 1965

Nation's total steel output. The Youngstown-Pittsburgh area produces 33 percent. If the canal is not built, the Cleveland-Detroit area will produce 18.1 percent of the Nation's steel production, while the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area will decrease to 15.7 percent in 2025.

However, if the canal is built, steel plants in the Cleveland-Detroit area will actually drop from their present rank in the national level of steel production.

The canal will help the Youngstown-Pittsburgh area, but at the expense of the Cleveland-Detroit area according to the engineers' own figures.

Supporters of the canal admit that if Cleveland continues to oppose the canal, it probably will not be built. So, earlier this month, an attempt was made to woo Cleveland.

Retired Cleveland port director, William Rogers, was hired as a consultant by Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., one of the organizations boosting the canal.

Shortly after going to work for the canal supporters, Rogers proposed a 29-mile breakwall that would extend along the shores of Lake Erie from the mouth of the canal at Fairport Harbor to Cleveland.

The canal traffic could travel behind this breakwall to Cleveland, Rogers explained. Cleveland could become the major canal port instead of small Fairport Harbor.

It would cost more than \$200 million he added.

To date, Cleveland officials have not reacted to Rogers' proposal.

In their own study of the corps' report, the railroads' Upper Ohio Valley Association leveled the heaviest blow at the engineers' 1.7 cost-benefits ratio.

In the 650-page report created by civil engineers, economists and transportation experts hired by the railroad, the association said that for every dollar spent on the project, taxpayers would receive 20 cents in benefits.

The association based its cost-benefits ratio on the following points:

1. The actual cost of construction will be nearly \$2 billion, or more than twice the corps' estimate.

2. Cost to the State of Ohio and its political subdivisions would be at least \$272 million, or more than three times the engineers' original estimate of \$85 million.

The association report questioned the recreational benefits of the Grand River Reservoir and the practicality of pumping water from Lake Erie to fill the manmade lake.

In the engineers' report, it was noted that the reservoir water level would have a 7-foot fluctuation. Water would be drained into the canal during dry periods in the summer, when the lake would be used the most for recreational purposes.

The association charged that with a 7-foot decrease in the reservoir's water level, the water would be surrounded by a mudflat more than 100 feet wide. "This," opponents said, "would not make the most attractive recreational area."

Further, the association raised the possible danger to the water level of Lake Erie from pumpage to the reservoir.

This fear for Lake Erie's water level has been echoed by the New York State Power Authority, which controls the hydroelectric facilities at Niagara Falls.

The power authority has filed an official statement of opposition to the canal on the grounds that it would endanger the lake's water supply.

Also fearful of the canal's effect on Lake Erie is the Great Lakes Commission, an organization composed of representatives from the various States surrounding the lake.

Corps engineers predict that the pumpage of water from Lake Erie into the huge reservoir will not alter the level of Lake Erie.

But opponents warn that "making sure millions and millions of gallons flow north

instead of south will be all but impossible due to the divide cut south of the reservoir."

One of the most interesting aspects of the billion dollar project is the silent treatment given it in Columbus.

Ohio's Gov. James A. Rhodes and his job-conscious development department are known nationally for their instant enthusiasm towards new investments in the Buckeye State.

But Rhodes has stayed out of the canal battle. He has not given it his support, or opposition.

Considering the canal is one of the largest Federal projects ever proposed for Ohio, Rhodes' silence is remarkable.

During the recent program to hire a \$200-million-plus atom smasher to the Ravenna Arsenal area Rhodes organized one of the strongest drives in the Nation. And he fought strongly to keep discord in Ohio at a minimum.

But no speeches have been made from the Governor's office about the \$1.25 billion canal.

One State official explained the silence, saying, "No one is really sure what this thing will do."

"On the surface, it looks good. But when you get into it, there are a lot of questions nobody seems to want to answer."

At present, the organizations lending official support to the canal are smaller in number than those opposing it.

The Mahoning Valley Industrial Council is strongly in favor of the project. So is Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., a lobby organization created by the council.

The Ohio Highway and Turnpike Association, lobby group composed of paving contractors, cement manufacturers, and other firms related to the heavy construction industry, is giving its full support to the project along with the Ohio Operating Engineers Union.

The canal will have little direct effect on the Akron area if it is constructed.

In fact, according to industrial leaders in Akron, any possible effect might be a negative one.

At present, a large amount of crude rubber is unloaded at Ashtabula Harbor from boats that have traveled down the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The rubber industry spokesmen say it would not pay to transfer the crude rubber from the seaway boats to barges because of high handling costs. Hence, they would not use the canal.

They note that because the canal would take away a major portion of the freight from existing lake ports, the port's ability to handle other freight would suffer.

In recent years, the rubber industry has invested heavily in a program to unload crude rubber at the Ashtabula Harbor.

The harbor would be hurt by the canal, industry leaders fear. And the industry's investments would be endangered.

Trucking spokesmen in Akron are less quick to comment on the canal than their counterparts in industry.

While the Pennsylvania Trucking Association opposes the project, the Ohio trucking group has remained silent.

Today, the various factions across Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the Nation are waiting for the Corps of Engineers Board for River and Harbors to rule on the project.

This group currently is evaluating the material and recommendations from the corps.

In the near future, possibly within a month, the Engineers Board will act on the corps' proposal to build the canal.

It could do one of three things.

It could refuse to approve the project. This would finish the issue.

It could return the project to the corps for further study. This is what has happened in the past.

It could approve the project and in time the proposal would be sent to Congress.

MADAME CHIANG

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over the years billions of dollars of our taxpayers' money has been paid out to maintain Chiang Kai-shek. Now Madame Chiang Kai-shek is in this country reportedly to appeal for more money for this boastful former corrupt warlord. It appears to me that we should long since have stopped pouring American dollars into this rathole. There was talk for political purposes some 10 years ago that we should unleash Chiang Kai-shek for invasion of the Chinese mainland to free the Chinese from communist rule. Of course, the American people were not informed then that unleashing Chiang Kai-shek meant logistical support, so-called, and protecting him with our 7th Fleet and war planes.

What is that logistic support that this warlord sought then and is apparently seeking now? It is that we provide our air power and our transports and our 7th Fleet to fight and kill Chinese civilians—men, women and children—as well as the armed forces of Red China in order to land some of the troops of Taiwan that have been trained over the years under American direction and equipped at the expense of American taxpayers. Then he would need our air forces and GI's to establish and maintain the beachhead. Except for the protection of our Air Force and 7th Fleet this boastful warlord would have been driven from Taiwan some years ago. Unfortunately we Americans have a bear by the tail—Chiang Kai-shek. We should let go.

The most fantastic proposal that he has made recently, and no doubt Madame Chiang Kai-shek will make in speeches in this country and in talks with any Government officials who listen to her, is that we invite some of Chiang Kai-shek's 600,000 troops to participate in the Vietnamese war. All Chiang and Madame Chiang request of this country is that the United States should furnish all logistic support, meaning protection by our air power and fleet of the 10,000 or more soldiers who would be moved from Taiwan to South Vietnam.

Of course, it would be required that the United States fully clothe these troops, equip them completely with arms and ammunition, pay them, and feed and maintain them during such time as they were in South Vietnam.

It would be a stupid and foolhardy policy on the part of the United States to permit even a token force of 100 of these troops to be transported to Vietnam. Chiang's army has grown old in parading and strutting around Taiwan. His soldiers may apparently parade well and look good except somewhat overage. It is certain that they would have to undergo training of some months before they could possibly be of any service in combat. The only thing accomplished by our permitting Chiang Kai-shek to unleash some of his soldiers for service in South Vietnam would be to aggravate the Communist leaders of Red China.

August 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

21199

For 18 years Chiang Kai-shek has been boasting about his making an attack on mainland China and conquering the Red Chinese. His boast is that following his landing with our logistic support and the backing of our 7th Fleet the peasants of Red China would rise in revolt. He overlooks the fact that very few peasants among the 700 million Red Chinese have any guns or ammunition and that modern wars cannot be won by hurling stones or fighting the enemy with bare hands. Nor could anyone be certain the Chinese peasants prefer Chiang Kai-shek. It is utter folly that after all this time we still support and maintain this so-called Generalissimo. Of course, some of the superduper war hawks in this country will echo Madame Chiang's plea that the United States should immediately perpetrate a Pearl Harbor—engage in a day of infamy—by destroying Red China's crude nuclear installations.

This lady's visit to the United States accomplishes nothing except embarrassment to administration leaders. Let us hope they ignore her. The facts are that the Vietnamese, those who live in the south as well as in the north, regard the Chinese as their natural enemies. For thousands of years the Vietnamese have fought and beaten back the Chinese invaders. In fact, the troops of this corrupt old warlord Chiang Kai-shek invaded Vietnam around 1947 directly after World War II and looted and killed in the northern area of Vietnam. The President of North Vietnam, Ho Chi-minh, was imprisoned in a cell for a year by the Chinese Communists. It is untimely that Madame Chiang Kai-shek has come to this country for anything other than personal reasons and to see what a free country looks like in contrast with Taiwan. Were we to permit any of Chiang Kai-shek's armed forces to march along with our soldiers in South Vietnam, even though none of them fired a gun, there would be danger that their presence along with our own GI's would provoke Chinese Communist intervention.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA BY SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, there was an impressive gathering in my State of Rhode Islanders of Lithuanian extraction, deploring the 25th anniversary of the occupation of Lithuania by Soviet Russia. The assembly, which was held in the hall of St. Casimir's Church in Providence, voted unanimously to continue Lithuania's brave and unrelenting fight to regain independence. The words of their resolution deserve the thoughtful consideration of everyone who treasures the precious right of political self-determination.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

RESOLUTION APPROVED BY RHODE ISLANDERS OF LITHUANIAN EXTRACTION ON OCCASION OF 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OCCUPATION

Whereas Soviet communism has demonstrated by principle and by act that its whole purpose is the domination of the world by the proletariat through the ruthless destruction and annihilation of all existing forms of government; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia by force of arms; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has deported nearly 400,000 Lithuanian citizens to concentration camps in Siberia and other areas of Soviet Russia for slave labor and death; and

Whereas Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians sincerely desire, fight and die for their national independence and liberation; and

Whereas Lithuania has been for over 20 years unjustly subjugated by Soviet Russia which has to this date steadfastly refused to permit the people of Lithuania to hold free elections: Now be it

Resolved, That we thank the President of the United States, Members of the U.S. Senate and Congress for their many kindnesses shown the Lithuanian cause, which caused the free world to recall and keep in mind the atrocities committed upon Lithuania and other Baltic nations by Soviet Russia; and be it

Resolved, That our Government take immediate and concrete steps to compel Soviet Russia to leave the territory of Lithuania, to return free elections in Lithuania under supervision of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, That the representatives of free Lithuania be given a full fledged seat in the United Nations which would permit her to state her righteous case to the world.

REV. VACLOVAS MARTINKUS, Chairman.
JOHN A. STOSKUS, Secretary.

THE \$22 MILLION PAYMENT TO OKI- NAWA IN PRETREATY CLAIMS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in view of the recent Senate vote to pay Okinawans \$22 million in pretreaty claims, I thought that my colleagues would be interested in editorial comment on our action by the Honolulu Advertiser, the major morning newspaper in Hawaii.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTING A WRONG

Amid news of far bigger spending and more heated problems this month was the important report that the U.S. Senate voted to pay Okinawans \$22 million in claims stemming from our postwar occupation.

This has been called righting an old wrong. It is a progressive step from the standpoint of justice, morality, and good international politics.

Most of the claims—about \$15 million—are for rental of land that was seized by occupation forces. The rest covers property damage, death, and injuries to Okinawans.

Okinawa was part of the Japanese empire when it was invaded in March of 1945. In the 1952 peace treaty, Japan waived all war claims for itself and its nationals, a fact cited as taking away any legal obligation by the United States or Japan.

But clearly U.S. Senator DANIEL K. INOUE was right when he told the Senate recently that this country should not let fine points of international law obscure the fact that it

assumed full responsibility for the protection and administration of the islanders in 1945.

The claims would go to about 180,000 families. With an average of five members to a family, the claims would benefit about 400,000 people, perhaps half the Okinawan population.

It is, in brief, an expression of good will and justice to a people who, through some good reasons and unfriendly agitation, have often indicated restlessness at U.S. rule.

The action is even more impressive this year because it is taken with the full backing of the administration which has not supported past attempts of Inoue and other members of Hawaii's Congressional delegation to help the Okinawans.

Favorable action in the House can be expected on this basis, and Hawaii can again take some satisfaction for a role in helping our Pacific neighbors.

EXEMPTION OF POSTAGE COSTS FOR GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on July 21, 1965 I introduced a bill—S. 2314—to provide for payment by the Federal Government of postage costs in the required distribution of Internal Revenue Service form No. 1099 information returns to individuals who receive \$10 or more in interest or dividends. On July 30, I received a letter from Mr. James H. Lynch, Jr., assistant general counsel of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, endorsing my bill. As Mr. Lynch wrote:

We see, on the one hand, the really tremendous effort by President Johnson and the Congress to lighten the tax burden on our expanding economy. Income tax rates have been reduced. Income tax forms have been simplified; and, just recently, the President signed legislation which eliminated, or substantially reduced, a great number of outmoded excise taxes.

We are confronted, on the other hand, with the rising costs to industry and the individual of tax compliance. Those costs, in many areas, are at or near the point of exceeding any benefits that may have resulted from tax relief or reform.

I am grateful, indeed, for Mr. Lynch's judgment, speaking for the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, that "S. 2314 is a constructive step in the right direction towards solving at least a part of this increasingly serious problem."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lynch's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATION OF
STOCK EXCHANGE FIRMS,
New York, N.Y., July 30, 1965.

Re S. 2314.

HON. R. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: On behalf of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, I commend—most warmly and appreciatively—your constructive effort to eliminate a very burdensome cost on American industry. We thoroughly support your bill, S. 2314 (to amend chapter 67 of title 39, United States Code, so as to authorize the free use of the mails in making reports required by law of certain payments to others).

The association, for your information and ready reference, is the voluntary trade organization for some 600 member firms of the

August 26, 1965

New York Stock Exchange. Our membership, which is nationwide, is most seriously affected by the present information return regulations of the Internal Revenue Service. We believe that your bill will do much to ease this increasingly onerous burden—and, more importantly, to resolve the seeming conflict between this administration's dynamic economic philosophy and the IRS regulatory pattern.

We see, on the one hand, the really tremendous effort by President Johnson and the Congress to lighten the tax burden on our expanding economy. Income tax rates have been reduced. Income tax forms have been simplified; and, just recently, the President signed legislation which eliminated, or substantially reduced, a great number of out-moded excise taxes.

We are confronted, on the other hand, with the rising costs to industry and the individual of tax compliance. Those costs, in many areas, are at or near the point of exceeding any benefits that may have resulted from tax reduction and reform. Your bill is beamed to an area where this situation has become acute.

Our association has called pointed and repeated attention to these areas that create needless tax compliance costs for the securities industry and for other financial institutions as well. While we are fully aware of the need for realistic compliance measures, to insure enforcement of the tax statutes and to guarantee that every taxpayer will bear his proper tax load, we reiterate two compelling questions: At what point does the cost of tax compliance imposed on private industry outweigh the tax benefits realized by Government? Is it fair to impose systems and procedures on the American business community that result in substantial—even excessive—administrative costs, in order that Government's rightful enforcement role may be somewhat easier?

Our prime case in point is this: The Internal Revenue Code presently requires payors, including nominees, to furnish the Government information returns indicating the aggregate amount paid to taxpayers, and also to furnish a like statement to the taxpayer himself. Our member firms, other members of the securities industry, and other financial institutions are thus required to furnish taxpayers with a completely useless piece of information. This makes the postage cost feature even more unpalatable.

I say "useless information" with good reason: Our member firms already supply their customers with monthly or quarterly itemized statements which contain not only a record of their stockholdings and securities transactions, but also a record of all dividend and interest payments credited to them during the month. These customer statements itemize such dividends and interest payments received from the corporate payors by the broker as nominee for his customer. These statements are what the customer-taxpayer uses in preparing his income tax return. This is the information he must have in order to properly prepare his income tax return—not some aggregate figure on a Government-prescribed form which is meaningless to him and, in many cases, to the broker who prepared it.

We have attempted—many times, and with a marked lack of success—to convince IRS that furnishing such information to our customers is a wholly unnecessary, excessively expensive duplication of data already available.

We think, therefore, that your bill, S. 2314, is a constructive step in the right direction towards solving at least a part of this increasingly serious problem. We hope the bill receives early and favorable consideration in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. If there is any way the Association of Stock Exchange Firms can be of

further assistance to you in expediting its passage, please let me hear from you.

Sincerely,
JAMES H. LYNCH, Jr.,
Assistant General Counsel.

THE WHEAT SHIPPING REQUIREMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Monday the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] appeared on the National Broadcasting Co.'s "Today" show to discuss with Sander Vanocur the requirement that 50 percent of commercial sales of wheat to Russia and Eastern European countries must move in American ships.

The requirement has simply prevented any sales occurring, as Senator McGOVERN explained.

The junior Senator from South Dakota made such a fine and clear explanation of the issue that many of us are getting a heavy volume of mail expressing wonder that the regulation exists.

Because of the mail in regard to the broadcast, I obtained a transcript of it and believe others would benefit from having a copy available. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TODAY SHOW

(On NBC Television, Aug. 24, 1965,
Washington, D.C.)

FRANK BLAIR. The recent purchase by the Soviet Union of Canadian wheat has caused a stir among Democratic and Republican Senators from wheat producing States. They're seeking to have the White House change the requirements set during President Kennedy's administration that 50 percent of such U.S. wheat exports be shipped in U.S. vessels. This requirement, the Senators believe, so raises the cost for the Soviets that they will no longer buy our wheat.

One of the Senators who is leading the fight against the requirement is George McGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota. He is in our Washington studios this morning with "Today" show's Washington correspondent Sander Vanocur. Sander?

Mr. VANOCUR. Senator McGOVERN, since the Soviet Union has recently purchased almost a half a billion dollars worth of wheat, mostly from Canada, and are likely to continue purchasing Western wheat for the next few years, why can't the American wheat farmer get a share of this market, since the principle of selling wheat to the Soviet Union was seemingly approved in 1963?

Senator McGOVERN. Well, the American wheat farmer should have a share of this business. We have about 800 to 900 million bushels of wheat in surplus in this country, in our reserve stocks, a good part of which we ought to sell. We have another big crop coming on this year, and as you say, we made a policy decision 2 years ago that it was in our national interest to sell wheat to the Soviet Union, and to the countries of Eastern Europe, then, very mistakenly, in my view, we put on an administrative ruling that required that 50 percent of any wheat that we sell to the Soviet Union, or to the countries of Eastern Europe, must move in American ships, and that simply raises the price, anywhere from 11 to 15 cents a bushel, to the buyer, and as a consequence, the Soviet Union and the other countries in Eastern Europe are not buying any American wheat. They're going

to Canada, Australia, France, or Argentina, and completely bypassing the American market, and as long as that shipping restriction exists, we're not going to sell any wheat, in my view, to the Soviet Union.

Mr. VANOCUR. Senator, was this an administrative decision by President Kennedy's administration, in 1963, or did Congress have to do it?

Senator McGOVERN. The Congress had nothing at all to do with it. It was a decision that was reached by the Kennedy administration at the time of the Russian wheat proposal in 1963. My understanding is that that restriction was placed on the deal as a means of winning support from some of the maritime unions. Actually, it hasn't helped them in any way at all, because the net result of that restriction placed by the administration, it's been continued by the present administration, has been to deny us any opportunity to sell wheat in Eastern Europe, so when we talk about requiring 50 percent of the wheat and other grains that might move into that part of the world going in American ships, we're actually talking about 50 percent of nothing. We're not helping the maritime unions; we're not helping anyone, and we're depriving the wheat farmers of this country of an opportunity to sell hundreds of millions of dollars of wheat and other grains to the Soviet Union, and to the countries in Eastern Europe.

Mr. VANOCUR. Senator, tell me first, what is the size of the potential market, given Soviet agricultural difficulties?

Senator McGOVERN. Well, I would estimate that this year, the Soviets may be in the market for as much as 14 or 15 million tons of wheat. Now, they have recently completed arrangements with the Canadians, and a smaller deal with the Argentines, and a somewhat smaller deal with the French, to purchase somewhere around 7 million tons, but every indication is, that before the end of this year, they're going to need another 6 or 7 million tons. Now, the Canadians have just about exhausted their capacity to meet that need. Their port facilities are strained to the limit; their shipping opportunities are almost fully utilized, and they're contracted now for almost the maximum amount of wheat they can deliver.

Mr. VANOCUR. Put this in dollar figures on a yearly basis.

Senator McGOVERN. Well, I would say somewhere around a billion dollars this year. Now, last year, the Russians purchased something over a half a billion dollars in wheat from the Western World, and they're going to be in the market this year for an even larger amount, from all indications. The evidence we have is that this year, their crop is no better than it was in 1963, which was a bad year. They had a somewhat better crop in 1964, although it was not particularly a good harvest. Now, from what we can learn, they're back to the level of about 1963, in terms of production, so that I would think there's still a half a billion dollars worth of potential business that has not yet been completed in this calendar year.

Mr. VANOCUR. And for the foreseeable future?

Senator McGOVERN. Well, every indication is that for the next few years, they're going to be in the market for several billion tons of wheat each year, in the Western World. There's no reason that I can see why we wouldn't get at least half, and maybe more than half, of that business.

In other words, we're talking about perhaps as much as \$250 million in wheat sales that the United States could make, were it not for this restriction on shipping, what I referred to as a self-defeating restriction; it's a restriction that doesn't help anyone.

BRIGHTER DAY IN VIETNAM
 EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. ROY H. M-VICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, how are we faring in the Vietnamese war?

Many competent and sophisticated observers, inside Government and out, now are expressing cautious optimism concerning the progress of the war there.

The summer offensive of the Vietcong aggressors has not been an unqualified success. A recent operation by U.S. Marines in the Van Tuong Peninsula was a striking military success. And many observers feel that other signs are developing which give us reason to be hopeful.

Two excellent editorials on this subject appeared recently in newspapers in the Washington area. I commend them to the attention of my colleagues, and I offer them today for inclusion in the Record. The first, entitled, "Brighter Day in Vietnam," appeared in the Washington Evening Star, Wednesday, August 25; the second, entitled, "Optimism, Cautiously," appeared in the Baltimore Sun on the same day.

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 25, 1965]

BRIGHTER DAY IN VIETNAM

There is no reason to doubt that the dominant feeling in Washington official circles today is one of optimism with respect to the war in Vietnam.

Almost nothing is being heard from the Cassandras who, just a few months ago, were shouting from the housetops that the United States was headed for a major disaster in southeast Asia. They are silent, significantly so, and the reason is not hard to find.

For some weeks now the tide of war has been slowly turning in South Vietnam. There have been no spectacular victories of late for the Vietcong. The monsoon season is approaching its end and the massive Communist assault, which the pessimists feared, has yet to materialize. Finally, last week's smashing victory at Chu Lai by the U.S. Marines has put a new face on the whole business. It had been accepted as gospel that a numerical superiority of 10 to 1 was needed for successful offensive operations against the guerrillas. But the Marines, with a superiority of less than 3 to 1, trapped the unit of some 2,000 battle-hardened Vietcong, dug them out of their caves and tunnels, and decisively defeated them in the worst setback of the war for the Communists.

The difference probably was in airpower and superior firepower. These are advantages, however, which the enemy cannot take away from us. And the demonstration at Chu Lai of their effectiveness must be causing serious second thoughts in Hanoi about the wisdom of any mass attack on U.S. positions. In this connection a word might be said about the bombings by the B-52's and other aircraft. They have been ridiculed as attacks which accomplished nothing except to devastate jungle areas abandoned by the Vietcong. Yet the evidence is accumulating that these bombings have kept the Vietcong off balance, prevented any large massing of their forces, and have seriously depressed their morale.

It is true, of course, that the course of battle does not necessarily run in one direction all the time. In Vietnam, it may change again. But for the moment there is plenty of reason to believe that cautious optimism

is justified, and that mounting pressures and fading victory hopes may serve before too long to bring the Communists to the conference table.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 25, 1965]
OPTIMISM, CAUTIOUSLY

Cautious and tentative optimism about Vietnam in Washington is based on a number of factors, among them the failure of the Vietcong to step up its activities as heavily as had been expected during the monsoon season, supposedly favorable to their sort of fighting, and last week's successful Marine action on the Van Tuong Peninsula.

As to the first, no one knows why the Vietcong have not so far taken greater advantage of the monsoon. Perhaps they are hurt more than had earlier been thought. Perhaps they are having troubles of morale and supply. And perhaps to a considerable degree the monsoon is more supposedly than really favorable to them; perhaps their capabilities in rainy conditions are not, after all, so distinctly superior to those of their opponents.

As to the Van Tuong Peninsula battle, as it may properly be described, Mark S. Watson has noted in the Sun that conditions were exactly right for that undertaking. These conditions he lists as: a sufficiently large force of U.S. troops concentrated at one point, well armed and trained for this kind of fighting; a compact concentration of the Vietcong, so that a well-planned attack could envelop an entire enemy force; exact intelligence of the enemy concentration; perfect coordination of all U.S. elements, with no less-trained troops taking part; a false sense of safety on the part of the Vietcong. In addition we may note that, unlike most of the inland areas of Vietnam, the Van Tuong Peninsula had the character of a field for decisive—locally decisive—battle. Merely from the published air photographs, it looked like a battlefield.

The rarity of a coincidence of such conditions is written in the bitter record of fighting in Vietnam over many years. The action does suggest that in other specifically American operations similar conditions will be sought for, and the geography of Vietnam suggests that they will be along the coast, not inland. But this is not to be read as the beginning of victory. Any optimism must continue to be most cautious, and most tentative, most limited, in the short term and in the long. And in Vietnam, what in any case is the definition of "victory"?

**Activities of the Rightwing Minutemen
 Organization in Wisconsin**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues that my good friend, Congressman JOHN A. RACE, of Wisconsin's Sixth District, has received support from a Milwaukee television station in his efforts to document the activities of the militant, rightwing Minutemen organization in Wisconsin.

The TV editorial of WTMJ-TV, on Friday, August 20, said RACE deserved encouragement for his work in spotlight-

ing the Minutemen efforts to enlarge the scope of their activities.

The editorial follows:

BROADCAST ON WTMJ-TV BY MR. BOB HEISS, 10:15 P.M., FRIDAY, AUGUST 20, 1965

Last month California became the 24th State to make private armies illegal. At the time, the State's attorney general, Thomas Lynch, said: "We cannot allow bands of deluded individuals to wander our deserts and mountains armed with grenades, bazookas, mortars, and machineguns, and plotting outrageous schemes of guerrilla warfare."

Of course they can't. No State should. If Wisconsin's laws are inadequate our legislature ought to ban armed groups. Perhaps Federal legislation is needed to cope with the growing threat.

Wisconsin's Sixth District Congressman, JOHN RACE, is mustering forces to get such legislation on the books. He is aiming particularly at the Minutemen, which is a militant, rightwing organization. Although the Minutemen claim their primary purpose is to protect American citizens from Communist subversion, RACE fears the organization itself may be an embryonic subversive group. He charges that while the Minutemen are voicing a callous disregard for the leaders and policies of the Federal Government, they are hurriedly amassing a large arsenal of automatic weapons. In this connection, Minutemen leaders urge members to join gun clubs so they can get free ammunition from the Government. This creates a ludicrous situation in which any potentially subversive organization could be partially subsidized by Washington.

Although the Minutemen organization probably has made its greatest gains in California, RACE says he has proof of activities in Wisconsin. Representative RACE has carefully documented his reasons why groups such as the Minutemen should be outlawed. He is gathering more evidence before deciding whether to sponsor restrictive legislation. He deserves encouragement. For while the Constitution confers upon private citizens the right to bear arms, it certainly does not give them the right to form private armies. This must be stopped.

Now It Can Be—Fresh Water Anywhere

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Waukesha, Wis., was, in earlier days, known as one of the great watering places of the Middle West. Here, mineral spring water has been bottled for decades. To this "Saratoga of the West" came Mrs. Abraham Lincoln in the years of her desperate search for restoration of her health.

In 1965, Waukesha has again achieved worldwide renown as a watering place—this time through the efforts of Aqua-Chem, Inc., probably the best known of all the producers of desalting plants for making fresh water.

As a matter of interest to my colleagues, relating to this highly current and greatly significant matter, I set forth here the lead article from the August issue of Wisconsin Business News magazine:

August 26, 1965

A4838

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

Now It Can Be—FRESH WATER ANYWHERE

The state of the art is a favorite expression these days when summarizing progress made in a particular scientific or mechanical area.

In the matter of converting seawater to fresh water, no one company is more aware of the state of the art than Aqua-Chem, Inc., Waukesha, a subsidiary of Cleaver-Brooks Co., Milwaukee.

Aqua-Chem is the first and only company in the world devoted entirely to the manufacturing of water desalting units. Desalting plants by Aqua-Chem—over 4,000—account for nearly 50 percent of all such plants operating in the world today.

Land-locked and coincidentally located in a city known for its pure spring water, Aqua-Chem has shaped and fused metals into desalination plants from Point Barrow, Alaska, the northernmost city in the United States, to a lonely U.S. Navy Base at McMurdo Sound, Antarctica, and from southern California around the world to Kuwait.

Visitors in the beautiful Princess Hotel in Bermuda enjoy Aqua-Chem pure water converted from the sea near the island resort.

Our Navy men on the supercarriers *Independence* and *Enterprise* shower daily with pure water converted from the sea by Aqua-Chem units.

Passengers on the two Italian luxury liners, *Michelangelo* and *Raffaello*, can drink, swim in, bathe in, and eat fresh vegetables cooked in pure water converted from the sea.

Patients in many hospitals like the King Edward Hospital, Hamilton, Bermuda, have received intravenous injections containing water purified from the Atlantic Ocean.

Italy's largest steel producer, Italsider, at Taranto has an Aqua-Chem unit converting nearly 1,200,000 gallons of fresh water per day—water ultrapure with less than one part of salt per million parts of fresh water.

An 800,000 gallons per day plant extension by Aqua-Chem has given one of the largest seawater desalting plants in the world—located on the island of Aruba, Netherlands Antilles—a total capacity of 3,300,000 gallons of fresh water per day.

The importance of adequate supplies of fresh water has been underscored recently by developments along the Atlantic coast from Maine to Virginia where a combination of drought and eroding shores has created shortages of water as well as serious pollution of deep water wells.

New York City and its environs, heavily dependent on its aqueduct and reservoir supply system, has been particularly hard-hit. Eroding shores along the New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland coasts have succeeded in forcing saline water into nearby fresh water wells.

What then is the state of the art in the water conversion field? Can we meet this challenge to our greatest natural resource, not only here in the United States but throughout the world?

Last year, by special invitation of a Presidential task force, Gordon Leitner, Aqua-Chem executive vice president, reported that his company could guarantee performance on water desalination plants in the 50 to 150 million gallons per day range, using nuclear energy as a power source.

Fred Loebel, president of the company and holder of many vital patents in the field, has revealed that Aqua-Chem has accomplished design studies for a 25-million-gallons-per-day plant for the Puerto Rico Water and Power Commission—a 50-million-gallons-per-day plant for the Presidential task force—and a 150-million-gallons-per-day unit for large municipalities such as the Los Angeles and Long Island, N.Y., areas.

A representative set of figures from the 50-million-gallons-per-day plant indicates a cost of 34 cents per 1,000 gallons of fresh water, within range of the ability to pay most municipalities requiring large capacity plants.

While large capacity plants are getting the major share of attention from planners, packaged plants have also attracted interest.

Loebel reports that another dimension of Aqua-Chem has been its packaged unit concept for hotels, resorts, institutions, etc., and that there is a growing market for these all over the world.

Packaged plants, he says, are getting larger as well as smaller, or because of technological advancements, a plant of x capacity built just 5 years ago would be much more compact today. Marine plants are now one-half the physical size they were 10 years ago.

Aqua-Chem, for instance, has six plants on order in the 100,000-gallons-per-day size and one in the 200,000-gallons-per-day capacity—all high temperature, multistage flash evaporators—that will be fully packaged, complete with all piping, pumps, controls ready to go when set down, and utilities connected.

Loebel discloses that his company now has the capability of putting a 500,000 gallons-per-day plant on a flat-car and will be able, in a short time, to completely package a 1 million gallons-per-day plant.

Aqua-Chem has manufactured the three largest marine sea water conversion plants in the world—280,000 gallons per day for the U.S.S. *Enterprise* and two 240,000 gallons-per-day units for the new twin luxury liners, *Michelangelo* and *Raffaello*.

Every cabin—from tourist to first class—on the latter ships has a private bathroom.

More than 300 modern flash evaporator plants on all types of ships throughout the world from nuclear submarines to the first nuclear-powered transport, NS *Savannah* have been designed and manufactured by Aqua-Chem.

Aqua-Chem, though, is not only looking up—at 150 million-gallons-per-day plants—but down as well, as the low-capacity unit.

As Loebel puts it, "Sometimes it's more difficult to build small things. It's more difficult, for instance, to make a wristwatch than an alarm clock."

For several years, Loebel has been working on the development of domestic units from 1 to 50 gallons per day. He has a unit now with almost no moving parts and a hot water tap as well as cold water tap.

Aqua-Chem has manufactured a number of 5 gallons-per-day units and is marketing them on a limited basis. In addition, the company has made a number of the 50 gallons-per-day-size units for the Army Medical Corps for field use in producing sterile water for intravenous injection solutions.

A couple of dozen vending machines of the 50 gallons-per-day capacity are being test-marketed in the southern California area.

Is there an overall market to justify this development activity?

Certainly. A recent survey indicates that more than 3 million people in 1 million households are now served by public water systems with 1,000 parts per million of dissolved salts. The U.S. Public Health Service considers this type of water unfit to drink.

And water pollution problems are becoming increasingly acute throughout the Nation.

Aside from the obvious health benefits—absence of salt, nematodes, bacteria, etc.—pure water has numerous other bonuses.

Contrary to popular belief, pure water is not flat. Cool and aerated, it has a pure flavor very few people have experienced. The flat idea, Loebel discloses, comes from distilled water left on shelves for months and tasted warm. Even the best spring water, he says, would be unpalatable under similar conditions.

Pure water, the Aqua-Chem president claims, really opens up new dimensions in cooking. Market studies show that people who have once tried the pure, desalted water in coffee, soups, for cooking seafood, in ice cubes and water for cocktails, never want to

return to their old water supply, even if it is fairly good.

Uses for small units would be in contaminated areas where private wells suffer from septic tank pollution, detergent contamination or from sea water itself; in areas where qualitative problems are great—bad taste, foul odor, etc.; in vacation or mobile homes; and in hospital and commercial laboratories where the need is great for sterile water.

Aqua-Chem, says Loebel, is cooperating with President Johnson who has called for a major breakthrough in the cost of desalting water and urged the beginning of a bold new program toward converting large quantities of heavily salted water at the lowest possible cost in the shortest time.

"Whether the source of energy needed to desalt water be the atom, coal, oil or gas, the work accomplished by our research and engineering has made us ready," Loebel concludes.

New Coinage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I had the honor to witness the manufacture of the one-millionth pound of clad metal for our new coins.

The ceremony took place at the Metals and Controls Division of Texas Instruments, Inc., in Attleboro, Mass. It marked the first stage of a large contract that will not only transform our coinage system but will prove to the world the usefulness and serviceability of clad metals.

Already clad metals are contained in every household, every automobile, every TV set and every radio, but all this seems only the beginning of a dramatic expansion of the use of such metals in every phase of American life.

We were particularly pleased to have as guest of honor at this ceremony my colleague from western Massachusetts, Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of his speech be printed at the conclusion of my remarks:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN SILVIO O. CONTE

Today when I can see the results of a protracted legislative battle, I am satisfied that all the long hours of study, meetings, debates and speeches were worth every minute of the effort expended.

Today we stand at the end of a long and torturous road and at the beginning of a new era. I look back on my call for a new system of coinage for this country, which I first made more than 3 years ago—a coinage system that would break the tie of dependence upon an ever more critical supply of silver. We all look back on the tradition of silver coins. That tradition could be traced back to 1792, but today had become a luxury that we simply could no longer afford. We all look back on periods of serious coin shortages, of doubling and redoubling our annual coin production, of working our mints 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and still not bringing the supply of coins in line with the demand for them.

More importantly, for Metals and Controls, for the people of Attleboro, for all of Massa-

August 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4829

opposition of those who "know it can't be done" and those "who like the town the way it is."

What is that little something which makes it possible for one small town to show all the signs of a boom while most towns of its size are slowly fading away? It is difficult to point out exactly what provides the spark but we think it must be the community leaders.

In a small town, an enormous amount of good can be done by a few people working with the betterment of the community at heart. A few individuals, working separately or together, who are willing to devote a few hours a week to thoughts and actions aimed at improving their community can do wonders.

We think therein lies the secret of Oakland's success. Due to the generosity of the late Frank Eckels, long a respected community leader, and the followthrough of younger citizens, the golf course and the library came into being. From that time, Oakland has displayed far more than its share of community growth and pride.

How far the present impetus of community accomplishment can carry Oakland is difficult to say. Those of us who know the young businessmen that are providing the spark in that community wouldn't want to sell them short. We wish them all the luck in the world.

A Veto by the President**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVINGER**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Speaker, the President went to great pains to explain that he vetoed the important military construction measures only because he was advised it was an unwarranted and unconstitutional restriction on the power of the President to deal quickly and decisively with national emergencies.

The newspaper reaction to this decision has been extremely favorable as this editorial from the August 24 Philadelphia Inquirer illustrates. This incisive analysis deserves wide distribution, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

A VETO BY THE PRESIDENT

We support strongly President Johnson's veto of the \$1,780 million military construction bill. The veto is a weapon that Mr. Johnson has used sparingly. In this instance he used it wisely.

It should be emphasized, however, that the bill he vetoed is an essential piece of legislation which needs to be enacted at this session of Congress. In view of the critical situation in southeast Asia it would be folly to postpone vital military construction projects until next year. We urge Congress to remove or modify the provision to which the President objected and then proceed promptly to pass the measure again.

The veto was aimed at a section of the bill that would have forbidden the President to close any military installation, or reduce its functions substantially, unless an advance notice of 4 months were given to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. Mr. Johnson declared—rightly so, in our opinion—this would be congressional intrusion upon constitutional powers of the President.

Aside from the constitutional question, the provision would hamstring national security and defense. In these troublesome and uncertain times it is necessary to maintain military flexibility. If the President deems it advisable—for the safety of the country and to maintain maximum efficiency of the Armed Forces—to shift the functions of a military base to some other location, he ought to be able to do so speedily and without political interference. It is neither reasonable nor prudent to demand that he notify Congress 4 months in advance.

We would advocate that, as a routine matter of policy, the President make a practice of consulting with Congress and keeping its Members fully informed on changes of status in military installations—but he should not have his hands tied by a mandatory 4-month waiting period. To impose unwarranted restriction upon Presidential power to act decisively and immediately, in the national interest, is to tamper dangerously with the security of the country.

Fe O'Neil King
Why We're in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently the trustees of Freedom House in New York, a distinguished and well-informed group of patriots, issued a balanced, temperate, and wise statement concerning this Nation's involvement in Vietnam.

The reasons advanced by these Americans for continuing to support free South Vietnam in its struggle against aggression are, I think, incontrovertible. Highlights of the Freedom House statement appeared recently in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah.

I offer for entry in the RECORD the highly interesting editorial on this matter, "Why We're in Vietnam," and I rise to salute the officials of Freedom House for the excellent statement which they advanced. This editorial—and the Freedom House statement—will lend balance and perspective to the national dialog on Vietnam:

WHY WE'RE IN VIETNAM

As any American who has followed the course of events in Vietnam knows, there are plenty of valid reasons for being critical of the U.S. involvement there.

Among them is the danger of spreading our military forces too thin, of doing the South Vietnamese fighting for them, of fighting an unfamiliar type of warfare on the enemy's terms rather than on our own in a land where it's hard to distinguish foe from friend, and of drawing Red China into the conflict in such a way that might bring on world war III.

These criticisms—and others—are being loudly voiced by the administration's critics in the intellectual community.

The administration and its supporters maintain, however, that the North Vietnam Government is just a puppet being manipulated by Red China for the purpose of spreading its Communist empire, that the will of the Vietnamese people to resist this aggression is attested to by the hundreds of thousands who have given their lives fighting it

or who have fled before its advances, that the United States is receiving help in Vietnam from a score or more of nations, and that opinion polls show the great majority of the American public believes President Johnson is doing the right thing in Vietnam.

In a debate where both sides are so diametrically opposed, what's the ordinary citizen to believe?

In the interest of clarifying the thinking being done about Vietnam, the trustees of Freedom House in New York have issued a credo which makes a great deal of sense. It includes:

Our withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances cannot be sustained on moral grounds. * * * Having freely accepted responsibility as a world power and a champion of freedom, the United States would dishonor that role by defaulting on its promises and commitments. Such default would not only abandon men, women, and children to cruel reprisals; it would seriously undermine the credibility of our commitments to other nations.

The decision to halt Communist aggression—whether in Vietnam, Laos, or the Congo—is clearly in the interest of the United States and other nations of the free world.

We welcome the recognition of a common interest which has prompted Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea to take an active part in the present struggle. We hope other allies will join in the defense of free world areas threatened by Communist wars of national liberation.

The United States is not embarked on a military crusade against Communist nations. Our record in dealing with the Iron Curtain nations of Europe and living peaceably with their Communist-controlled societies is our credential.

We regret the world is still racked by force rather than run by reason. But we also see no hope for reason until the force of lawlessness is checked. Our troops and arms are not mere engines of destruction; they are instruments of prevention. We mean to use them as judiciously as possible. But we do mean to use them effectively.

The objective of our involvement in Vietnam is not total annihilation of the Communist Vietcong; rather, it is to convince them by the only means they apparently understand—strength and the willingness to use it—that the best interests of all will be found not on the battlefield but at the conference table.

In working to achieve the goal of an honorable peace in Vietnam, the administration needs the wholehearted support of the American people.

Near East Refugee Problem**SPEECH
OF****HON. KEN W. DYAL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 24, 1965

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the thoughtful and careful presentation of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], on the refugee problem in the Near East. He has performed a great service in the last few weeks in bringing to the Congress the problem of the arms race and its dangers, the water conflict and today his excellent suggestion on refugees. He has performed a great service to the

A4830

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 26, 1965

House and the State Department in his research and analysis.

Mr. Speaker, when I traveled in that land I discovered that every effort had been made to settle the Arab question in an equitable and just manner. I discovered that there were Arabs in the Knesset and there were at least three Arab political parties, with complete freedom to participate in the affairs of government. Arab Christians are permitted freedom of religion and enjoy the use of their own language. The Israeli Government maintains Arab schools. There are over 250 state schools for Arabs with some 34,000 pupils. You may be assured that there is freedom and opportunity for these people within the new nation. Under the Israeli Government they have made advancement and progress, far in excess of their fellows across the border. The refugees have been forcibly kept from returning and have been maintained as a festering sore in the Near East. The truth that I speak here today has been well documented. This House knows that it is true, our State Department knows that it is true. We should, therefore, make it plain to Mr. Nasser and his puppets that they should quit playing politics with the unfortunate lives of these poor people.

Mr. ROOSEVELT's suggestions on the floor this week deserve careful consideration.

W. T. Murphy
American Academic Community Supports
Freedom House Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the teach-ins on the American college campus and the Poet Robert Lowell's dramatic refusal to participate in the White House Festival of the Arts have widely been interpreted as an indication that America's intellectuals do not agree with our policy in Vietnam.

I have never felt this to be the case and I want to call your attention to a graphic piece of evidence which demonstrates the general support which President Johnson has in the academic community.

Faculty members at 70 colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education—a total of more than 130 in all—have endorsed the Freedom House statement which declares that withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would be morally indefensible and that the decision to halt Communist aggression is in the vital interest of the free world nations.

Evidence of this kind of general support is so important that I include the August 23 Freedom House release in the RECORD at this time:

AMERICAN ACADEMIC COMMUNITY SUPPORTS
FREEDOM HOUSE STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

More than 130 members of the American academic community have publicly backed

the position of the U.S. Government in South Vietnam. Their action was taken in endorsing a Freedom House statement, which declares that the present policy of the United States "deserves the wholehearted support of the American people."

Faculty members at 70 colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education in the United States are among those expressing their agreement. Although a majority are in the fields of political science and international relations, the group includes scholars from a wide range of academic disciplines. A professor of economics at Cornell University, however, withheld his signature although he agreed with the statement and has "written various public officials to this effect." He expressed the feeling that "it is inappropriate for individuals with expertise in one field to use their position to attempt to influence the public."

The endorsements are in response to a letter mailed to a selected list of persons in academic life by Leo Cherne, chairman of the Freedom House Executive Committee. Writing on behalf of Freedom House, Mr. Cherne declared: "Too long, we feel, those with opposing views have been left a clear field to present themselves to the world as the single voice of American intellectuals."

In addition to the faculty members, hundreds of Americans in all walks of life have written to declare their agreement with the Freedom House statement on Vietnam. Most of them backed up their declaration with a contribution to permit the statement to be disseminated more widely.

They overwhelmingly endorsed the view that if the "aggression against South Vietnam—disguised as a 'war of liberation'—is not successfully resisted, more aggression and perhaps even larger scale war will follow."

The Freedom House statement included a credo of support, which declared that withdrawal from Vietnam under present circumstances would be morally indefensible and that the decision to halt Communist aggression is clearly in the interest of the free world nations. At the same time the statement noted that the United States is "not embarked on a military crusade against Communist nations" and that American military operations are "only part of the substantial U.S. program to enlarge the economic, social, and political future of the Vietnamese people."

The Freedom House effort to enlist support for our Government's Vietnam policy was welcomed by President Johnson in a letter to the organization's public affairs committee, dated July 19, as follows:

"I believe your statement in support of the policy of the United States toward Vietnam reflects the strong opinion of most Americans. What you say takes increased importance from your long and courageous record of opposition to all forms of tyranny."

"I am grateful for the position stated in your credo of support and I hope that others who feel as you do may be willing to join in this expression. Effective public support of our national purpose in Vietnam will hasten the coming of the peace which is our common purpose."

The members of the academic community who have endorsed the administration's policy in Vietnam are part of a growing list of faculty members who are communicating their views to Freedom House. New sponsors are adding their names daily; the list to date follows:

SPONSORS OF FREEDOM HOUSE STATEMENT

American International College: C. S. Samra.

The American University: Ernest S. Griffith, dean, School of International Service; Loy W. Henderson, director, Center for Diplomacy and Foreign Relations.

Bowling Green State University: Emanuel Solon, department of chemistry.

Brandeis University: Max Lerner, professor of American civilization.

Brooklyn College: Harry D. Gideonse, president; Hyman Kublin, department of history; Ivan D. London, department of psychology.

Brown University: William T. Hastings, professor of English emeritus.

Bryn Mawr College: Angeline H. Lograsso.

Carleton College: Reginald D. Lang, department of government and international relations.

The Catholic University of America: B. S. Brown.

Claremont Graduate School: George S. Blair.

Claremont Men's College: William S. Stokes, senior professor of comparative political institutions.

The College of Idaho: George V. Wolfe, professor of political science.

Columbia University: Daniel Bell, professor of sociology; Zbigniew Brzezinski, director, research institute on Communist affairs; William K. Jones, professor of law; Willis L. M. Reese, director, Parker School of Foreign and Comparative Law; Joseph H. Smith, professor of law.

Cornell University: Charles Ackerman, department of sociology; George H. Hildebrand, department of economics; Jacob Wolfowitz, department of mathematics.

Dartmouth College: John W. Masland, department of government.

Drew University: Will Herberg.

Elmhurst College: Royal J. Schmidt, professor of political science and history.

Fairfield University: John Norman, department of history.

Gallaudet College: Kurt Beermann, professor of history and political science.

George Washington University: Franz Michael, associate director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies.

Georgetown University: James D. Atkinson, department of government; Walter W. Wilkinson, department of history; Rev. Gerard F. Yates, S.J., international student programs.

Harvard University: Robert Braucher, professor of law; Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government, Littauer Center; Morton H. Halperin, Center for International Affairs; George C. Homans, department of social relations; Samuel P. Huntington, professor of government; William L. Langer, professor of history; Harvey C. Mansfield, Jr., department of government; George H. Quester, Center for International Affairs; George C. Shattuck, Medical School; Roland W. Thorwaldsen, Center for the Study of World Religions.

Hofstra University: Robert A. Christie; John C. Moore, department of history.

Hollins College: Victor Zitta.

Indiana University: Robert F. Byrnes, director, Russian and East European Institute; John E. Stoner, department of government.

Lehigh University: H. S. Braddick, department of international relations; Aurie N. Dunlap, department of international relations; A. Roy Eckardt, department of religion.

Macalester College: Arthur Upgren, department of economics.

Marquette University: Arthur C. Marlow, chairman, political science; Quentin L. Quade, department of political science; Eric Waldman, department of political science.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Lincoln P. Bloomfield, department of political science; Ithiel de Sola Pool, department of political science; Lucian W. Pye, department of political science.

Miami University: Dan N. Jacobs, professor of government.

Michigan State University: Charles R. Adrian, chairman, department of political science; Wesley R. Fishel, department of political science; J. Oliver Hall, department of social science.

August 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4831

New York University: Sidney Hook, department of philosophy; Frank N. Trager, professor of international affairs.

Ohio State University: James A. Robinson. Princeton University: Rowland Egger, Woodrow Wilson school of public and international affairs; Brooks Emeny, advisory council, Woodrow Wilson school of public and international affairs; William W. Lockwood, Woodrow Wilson school of public and international affairs.

Ripon College: William Fleming, chairman, department of political science.

Rutgers—The State University: Donald G. Herzberg, executive director, the Eagleton Institute of politics.

Sacramento State College: George Tokmakoff, department of history.

Saint Louis University: Francis J. Corley, department of history.

Smith College: M. Salvadori, department of history.

Southern Illinois University: William Goodman, chairman, faculty of government.

Stanford University: Stefan T. Possony, director, international political studies program, Hoover Institution.

State College, Shippensburg, Pa.: Benjamin Nispel, dean of arts and sciences.

Texas A. & M. University: Daniel Russell, professor emeritus of sociology.

Texas Christian University: Charles W. Procter, department of government.

Texas Western College: S. D. Myres, department of government; Roland I. Perusse, department of government.

Tulane University: Henry L. Mason, professor of political science.

University of Bridgeport: Victor E. Muntec, Justus M. van der Kroef, department of political science.

University of California, Berkeley: Eric C. Belquist, department of political science; Joseph P. Harris, department of political science; Seymour Martin Lipset, director, Institute of International Studies; Frederick C. Mosher, department of political science; William Petersen, department of sociology; Robert A. Scalapino, department of political science; Raymond J. Sontag, department of history; Aaron Wildavsky, department of political science.

University of California, Los Angeles: J. A. C. Grant, Robert G. Neumann, department of political science.

University of Chicago: Morton A. Kaplan. University of Cincinnati: Paul F. Power, department of political science.

University of Colorado: James L. Busey, department of political science; Edward J. Rozek, department of political science.

University of Connecticut: Arthur Bronwell, dean of engineering.

University of Maryland: Walter Darnell Jacobs, department of government and politics.

University of Michigan: Russell Fifield, department of political science.

University of Minnesota: Carl A. Auerbach, professor of law; Harold C. Deutsch, chairman, department of history; Samuel Krislov; C. H. McLaughlin, department of political science; Arnold M. Rose, professor of sociology.

University of Montana: Thomas Payne.

University of Pennsylvania: William R. Kintner, deputy director, Foreign Policy Research Institute; Robert Strausz-Hupe, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute.

University of Pittsburgh: Daniel S. Cheever, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs; John O. Hail, director, overseas programs, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs; Donald C. Stone, dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs.

University of Richmond: Spencer D. Albright.

University of South Carolina: Robert W. Foster, professor of law; James E. Larson, professor of political science.

University of Tennessee: Douglas Carlisle, department of political science.

University of Texas: Page Keeton, dean, school of law.

University of Washington: Imre Boba, Far Eastern and Russian Institute; Karl A. Wittfogel.

Upper Iowa University: Charles B. Clark.

Utah State University: Jay M. Bagley, civil engineering department; Carlton Culmsee, dean, College of Humanities and Arts; Elliot Rich, civil engineering department.

Wabash College: George A. Lipsky, political science and geography department; Warren W. Shearer, economics department.

Western Washington State College: Manfred C. Vernon, department of political science.

Yale University: Eugene V. Rostow, professor of law; Walter R. Sharp, professor emeritus of international relations; Alexander von Graevenitz, department of microbiology.

Yeshiva University: Joseph Dunner; Roman Vishniac, professor of biology.

Additional listings: Robert A. Goldwin, director, Public Affairs Conference Center, University of Chicago; William V. O'Brien, chairman, Institute of World Policy, Georgetown University; Robert Sobel, Department of History, Hofstra University.

Federal Government and Washington: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this House about the uninformed partnership of the Federal Government and the State of Washington in keeping gambling illegal in Washington and thus making gambling's lucrative profits available to the underworld.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Washington came to \$30 million. More significant—and more menacing—is Washington's illegal gambling activity. Testimony before the McClellan Committee indicated that off-track betting comes to about \$50 billion annually throughout the Nation, with this figure accounting for only some 42 percent of the national annual illegal gambling total, which would thus be \$120 billion. On a population basis, illegal gambling in Washington would come to about \$1.92 billion a year so that Washington is really a lucrative stamping ground for the syndicate. The mob cuts itself 10 percent of the illegal gambling take which means that they must be prospering mightily in Washington. Government-run gambling would siphon these moneys from mob treasuries putting gambling revenues to work for the people.

The best way to make gambling work for the public good—since it is basically ineradicable—is a national or series of State lotteries. If the State of Washington would wake up to social and financial reality, it would legalize, regulate and control gambling so that the gambling urge of the people of Washington could be made to work for rather than against society.

Why Does Not Economy Begin at Home?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Post Office Department is unbelievable indeed. Each day, my attention is called to some new and outrageous example of inefficiency. Just a few weeks ago, I called to the attention of my colleagues the incredible disappearance in the mails of over a half-million dollars worth of coin "proof sets" produced by the U.S. Treasury. This was a prime example of the gross incompetency with which our Post Office Department is presently being operated.

While Post Office Department officials contend they are taking steps to improve our mail service, the record is to the contrary.

My distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the Honorable GEORGE SHIPLEY, of Illinois, recently made some very pointed comments about economy in the Post Office Department. They were reprinted in the Omaha Postal Clerk and I ask unanimous consent to enter this article in the RECORD. The article follows:

DEPARTMENT ATTACKED BY ILLINOIS CONGRESSMAN

The following article appeared in the Nixie local 239, Springfield, Ill.

(What Representative SHIPLEY thinks of the mail service. Reprinted by permission of Gene Callahan, Illinois State Register political reporter.)

U.S. Representative GEORGE SHIPLEY, of Olney, has leveled severe criticism at the administration of Postmaster General John Gronouski for a Post Office decision to consolidate seven rural mail routes in SHIPLEY's 23d District. Here are excerpts from SHIPLEY's attack:

"Recently the Post Office Department announced it was going to cut some of the expenses within the Department and there would be a great savings to the taxpayers.

"It appears the Postmaster General is falling into the same old trap of the Washington bureaucrats in deciding where these savings should be made. It seems it is customary when the bureaucrats in Washington decide on savings, it is always savings someplace where it does not affect them."

SHIPLEY goes on to tell of his trip to Gronouski's office to complain of the cut in rural service.

"When I drove down to the Department, I pulled in front of the building which has a long drive about 500 feet long. This drive was filled to capacity with limousines and Cadillacs equipped with telephones and chauffeurs. But to the Postmaster General it is not a waste of money when you invest it in Cadillacs and limousines which are for the Department executives to travel around Washington and the country at taxpayers' expense.

"There is a limousine for the Postmaster General, one medium sedan for the Deputy Postmaster General and three medium and six light sedans for the various other postal executives. These are just for traveling around the District of Columbia. Nor was it a waste of funds for the Postmaster General to have ankle deep, plush carpeting and a reclining lounge chair in his office.

"The Department administrative staff in Washington numbers 1,498 and they have re-

A4832

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 26, 1965

quested 266 new employees for fiscal year 1966.

"The Postmaster General wants to cut down on the little rural route jobs which pay about \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year, but he certainly doesn't think it is wasteful when he requests 266 additional employees for his office. I can't figure out how he thinks he is saving the taxpayers money when he takes employees out of the rural areas and surrounds himself with new employees in the District of Columbia, where there are far too many employees already. If cuts are to be made, they should be made in Washington and not in rural areas.

"There would be more economy in Government if people in Washington, such as the Postmaster General, would do away with air-conditioned Cadillacs, chauffeurs, telephones in cars, red carpets and lounge chairs. Frankly, they could do away with a chauffeured Cadillac and there would be a lot less cost to the taxpayers than doing away with a rural route that we need. The air-conditioned, chauffeured limousines are not essential but the rural routes of America are."

SHIPLEY and Gronouski are both Democrats.

The above concludes the portion quoted from the Nixie. We in the State of Nebraska and local 11 are well aware of the waste in regional and top departmental offices. Recently four or five top Wichita regional officials came to Omaha to present the curtailment proposal to local 11 people. Then several weeks later a three- or four-man delegation from Wichita traveled the State of Nebraska telling the different communities about the sectional center concept. According to one Federationist in an outside town nothing was mentioned about the removal of RPO cars from the trains. My question is how much did the per diem and travel cost these men. The total savings for the Department in the proposal was less than \$2,500.

Teen Pickle Pickers Fail as Bracero Replacements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 26, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, many self-styled experts on farm labor have belittled and scoffed at the earnest pleas of Michigan cucumber farmers for help in harvesting the 1965 crop. The Johnson administration even selected this crop for one of its Great Society experiments by establishing the A-team program, the letters of another alphabetical creation meaning "athletes in temporary employment as agricultural manpower."

Today, cucumbers are rotting in the fields or are becoming so large they are no longer suitable for packing.

The Detroit Free Press sent one of its able writers into the Michigan cucumber growing areas for a firsthand report on the situation. The writer, John L. Dotson, Jr., has presented a very graphic picture of what is happening to the cucumber harvest.

His article, which appeared in the Free Press under the heading "Teen Pickle Pickers Fail as Bracero Replacements" follows:

TEEN PICKLE PICKERS FAIL AS BRACERO REPLACEMENTS

(By John L. Dotson, Jr.)

Sixteen-year-old Stan Brazille admits now that he didn't know what he was getting into.

He signed up as a pickle picker on a Saginaw area farm one day last week and found himself bent into one of the most excruciating positions he'd ever known.

"Backbreaking," he grimaced. "It was just backbreaking."

But, it was the first job he had ever had and he wasn't going to let it whip him. Stan showed up again the next day with his bagful of sandwiches and a canteen of cold water, ready to do battle with the sun and the hidden fruits on the 12-inch high vines.

Brazille, a Saginaw High School senior, and most of the boys around him had no idea why their services were in such great demand this year. Or of the controversy that surrounded their employment.

They were the domestic replacements for the Mexican braceros, the hard-working laborers whose annual trek to the Michigan pickle fields had been banned by Congress this year.

But, the question was, were they adequate replacements? Even if they learned how, would Brazille and the others stay at the job long enough to complete the harvest?

That first day, they had worked 6 hours. They expected to put in a full day and see what it's really like the second day. The field man in charge had showed the boys how to do the job the first morning.

Bend over, with your legs straight and about 3 feet apart, straddling the row of cucumber plants. Roll back the vine on one side and pick all the cucumbers longer than your thumb. Then, roll back the other side and do the same.

Over and over again, it was roll, pick, roll, pick, step, roll, pick, roll pick, step, through with one row, there was another to begin. The field man in charge made sure there was never an idle moment.

There aren't enough pickers in the pickle fields this year to have one able bodied, willing soul waste a minute.

At latest count, there was a shortage of 1,000 pickers at the peak of the crop, according to a survey by the Michigan Employment Security Commission, growers and processors claim that figure is far short of the actual need.

Saginaw Valley and Thumb area farmers are feeling the pinch the hardest. They had employed nearly 6,000 of the 13,800 Mexicans that had been imported for the harvest in 1964. This year they had cut back their planting by nearly a third, figuring they could get at least 4,000 domestic laborers through an intensive recruitment program.

They failed.

The result is hurting every cucumber farmer just as badly as the extended drought, which was the worst they had seen in nearly 30 years.

"That's a truckload of garbage I've got," said farmer Hank Keytylo, as he backed the latest harvest from his 20-acre cucumber patch into the receiving dock at the H. W. Madison Co. in Pinconning.

"I'll get \$50 for the whole truckload," he griped. "Any other year, I'd get \$150 for a truckload."

The trouble was that Keytylo's cucumbers, like most others in the valley, had been allowed to grow too large. And, large pickles are what a processor can do best without.

Pickle cucumbers, unlike the long, green table variety, are short, stubby fruits—the smaller the better for processing.

"I can't go on growing pickles at that rate, Keytylo said. Neither can other farmers.

Unless something is done, they say, Michigan can forget about the title of King Pickle.

The growers had warned Congress and the

rest of the agencies involved in the elimination of the bracero program that Americans just wouldn't pick pickles the way Mexicans did.

"The Latins are built for the job," said one farmer. "They're used to stooping in the fields all day and they're used to the heat. You can't get Americans to do the same thing."

"Poppycock," say Government labor officials. "That's just the impression that the growers would like everyone to get so that next year they can cry again to Congress for the return of braceros," one aid said.

The growers tried right up to planting time in May to get Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz to approve the importation of Mexicans for the Michigan fields. One committee recommended 5,000 for the harvest, but Wirtz was adamant.

The pickle farmers are the only ones in Michigan who miss the braceros because they are the only ones who used them. Every other crop in the State was picked by domestic laborers last year, except some truck crops, for which a handful of braceros was kept on.

There are several reasons Michigan farmers miss their braceros.

The Mexicans lived in migrant camps near the pickle fields and worked according to the cucumber growth. When the pickles grew fast, they worked longer hours and got through the fields more times. That meant money in the farmer's pocket.

For this, the Mexicans got a dollar an hour, a healthy wage by their standards. The rate of exchange gave them 12 pesos at the border, which bought a great deal more food and clothing in Mexico than it would here. That meant less money out of the farmer's pocket.

This year, cucumber growers are paying \$1.25 an hour to anyone over 18 years old and 95 cents an hour to younger pickers.

To replace the braceros, most pickle growers associations headed into Texas to line up friends and relatives of the few Mexican-American families that had traveled to the pickle fields with the braceros in other years.

Some, like the Croswell Pickle Growers Association, Inc., which supplies cucumbers for Aunt Jane's Foods, hired former migrant crew leaders to scour the Texas villages during the winter.

Erasmio (Eddie) Contreras, whose home is in Alamo, Tex., recruited more than 900 in the Rio Grande Valley to fill the shoes of the 1,290 braceros the Croswell growers had used the year before. The firm added another 500 local laborers to the force to make up the difference.

Just to make sure there'd be no waste in the cucumber fields, Field Manager Russell Horn said, Croswell ordered only 1,400 acres planted this year, a 47-percent reduction from last year.

"We're not short now, but maybe in the next 10 days we will be," Horn said.

It all depends on the weather. If there are warm nights and plenty of rain, the cucumbers may grow too large for pickling before they can be picked.

As it is this year, there are gangs of over-ripe, pumpkin-yellow cucumbers lying in the rows between the vines.

Vlasic Foods Co., a Detroit-based firm, put up a \$20,000 deposit with a private Texas recruiting agency for 2,000 field hands for the 6-week pickle harvest. Only 500 showed up.

It caught Vlasic off guard. The year before, it and Crown Pickle Co., which Vlasic acquired during the winter, employed 2,000 braceros. It was too much to make up.

"We had hoped earlier that we'd get 60 percent of the crop," a spokesman said.

"But, now it looks as though we'll only get 40 percent.

"We gambled and we lost."

August 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

21151

I testified before the joint committee in the following words:

We in the Congress often lose sight of our responsibility for the perfection of our democracy and the increased strength of our representative form of government. We sometimes fail to recognize that this perfection lies in the strength of our determination and willingness to regularly examine our Congress, its practices, and its achievements.

Those who drafted our Constitution in Philadelphia almost 180 years ago were wise in providing that each body should establish its own rules, and determine the qualifications of its own members. They knew that the Constitution could not specify a permanent code of rules or behavior for either the House of Representatives or the Senate. They realized perhaps better than we do today that both of these bodies must be constantly involved in perfecting and changing their mode of operation to insure representation which would be neither outdated nor perfunctory.

They gave to us, the Members of the 89th Congress, as they gave to the Members of each Congress preceding us and every one that will follow, the responsibility for cleaning our own house and maintaining the principles which they so highly valued.

It was for these reasons that on January 4 of this year, I submitted H.R. 1193 to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress. This commission was to have studied the operations of the Congress much as this Joint Committee is doing here today. I am most appreciative of this opportunity to come before you to discuss with you some ways in which I feel Congress may be improved.

Citizens today have a massive distrust of men in public life. The misconceptions involving men holding elective office extend even to a general assumption on the part of the public that every man in public life has at one time or another used his position for personal gain, pecuniary or otherwise. In the popular mind, the question is not even debatable.

This is a regrettable circumstance of present day participation in public life. Claims need no substantiation, they need no background, they do not even require a basis in fact. They need merely to be stated and promulgated to be believed.

What most people do not realize, even though it is comparatively simple, is that men holding public positions must be even more careful than any businessman or worker not to involve himself in any situation which could possibly compromise his oath of office or make him a culpable target of corruption charges. People do not seem to realize or understand the scrutiny which every man in public life must endure. His every action, public or private, is open to the examination of those he represents. Suspect behavior on the part of a man holding public office is immediately noticed and criticized by the citizens who elected him. Every action is carefully scrutinized by his political opponents. It would be a difficult thing indeed for a man in public life, especially a Congressman, to escape discovery of any corrupt or other reprehensible behavior of his.

Our code of ethics in the Congress is one to which many persons in private industry could not truthfully say they subscribe to in their business dealings. However, our code has one great failing: While it is there for reference by Members of Congress, it does not provide for any source which could advise a Congressman on specific questions of ethics or conduct.

Therefore, it would be my suggestion that a standing committee of the House of Representatives, to be known as the Committee on Ethics, with all the rights and privileges

to which a standing committee is entitled, be established. It would be a committee of our peers equally divided in membership between the two parties. This committee would meet regularly, discuss all relevant questions, and hear grievances filed against Members of Congress. This committee would also provide a much needed source for Congressmen to consult when an authoritative opinion on a question of ethics is required.

Sniping by political opportunists who use innuendo and smear to besmirch the characters of Members of Congress will, under this proposal, be put to the strictest of tests. The complaint charge will not be tried on the streets or in the newspapers or in the political clubhouses of the district in question. The conduct of the accused Member of Congress will be evaluated and a decision rendered by a group of his own peers who could be more exacting and more severe than any other body which could possibly be assembled for that purpose.

The present code does not provide for a fair and impartial hearing of ethical questions. Each Member of Congress should be entitled in objective hearing into the proprieties of his or her conduct. This Committee of Ethics which I propose would enhance the public's respect for the Congress and its Members. Equally important, I feel, is the revision and the updating of the regulations governing the earning of outside income by Congressmen. The incomplete and generalized grouping of regulations does not permit anyone, and that includes Members of Congress and the public, to reasonably determine the propriety of a Congressman's actions in private business or financial affairs which would involve his position as a representative of the people.

In light of last year's Supreme Court decisions in the cases of the *New York Times Company v. Sullivan* and *Garrison v. Louisiana* which hold, in effect, that public officials are subject to open criticism and even slander and that such statements made against public officials shall be considered a part of the liability assumed when the office was sought. Such a Committee on Ethics is made even more necessary. Little satisfaction may be made through a long, drawn-out contest in the courts: The charge will remain in the people's minds long after any judicial exoneration might be extended.

House Concurrent Resolution 260,¹ introduced by Mr. RUMSFELD, provides for a revamping of our ethics code, and, in my opinion, is a good bill. However, even it does not make provisions for a permanent consultative body, as I feel is necessary.

The Fair Campaign Practices Committee² exercises a certain amount of beneficial influence in determining campaign practices on all levels of government in all States, but the existence of this body and its effectiveness, as demonstrated in the past by ferreting out and exposing unfair political techniques and practices does not mean that we may abdicate our responsibility to them. The hearings held on December 17, 1964, relative to an article in *Pageant* magazine

¹ *The New York Times Company v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254, Docket No. 89, cited Mar. 9, 1964. Also, *Garrison v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 64, Docket No. 4, Nov. 23, 1964.

² H. Con. Res. 260, 89th Cong., 1st sess.; introduced on Feb. 8, 1965 by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD of Illinois; referred to the Committee on Rules.

³ The Fair Campaign Practices Committee (FCPC) is a privately supported educational organization located in New York City. Bipartisan and nonprofit by specific intent, it was established in 1954, and includes the following men as members of its board of directors: Charles P. Taft, of Cincinnati, chairman; James A. Farley, Steve Mitchell, Len Hall, and Mead Alcorn.

referring to certain Members of Congress held before the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures⁴ in the House of Representatives is ample evidence that there is indeed a need for such a committee. I hope that this joint committee will look favorably upon my suggestion.

Another area which I believe demands our attention is that of constituent relations. It has been suggested by some of my colleagues that congressional responsibilities in the area of constituent casework be transferred from the respective offices of the Members of Congress to a central clearinghouse which would expedite those matters to which the letters refer.

The critics of the present system of individual Member responsibility for his constituents' problems point out that if these heavy and often tedious responsibilities were shifted to a special office which would devote all its time to such matters, Congressmen would have more time to spend on legislative affairs and other matters related to the deliberative nature of the Congress. These critics claim that a Congressman is not a social worker, nor is he a ward boss seeking favors for his supporters, nor is he responsible for the crabgrass, arthritis, and selective service difficulties among his constituents. But I fear these men miss the point, for if the Congressman is not responsible for the well-being and comfort of those who live within his district then what is he responsible for? During this 89th Congress we are no longer even responsible for legislation. That job has been transferred to the Executive Office Building on Pennsylvania Avenue.

In Norway, a system of centralized casework for the members of the legislature, as has been suggested before this committee and by other critics of the present arrangement, has apparently worked well. For each member of the Norwegian parliament, the Storting, a caseworker, or Onbudsmann is appointed.⁵ But the drawbacks of this system if transplanted in the United States would soon become apparent. The Onbudsmann would be merely one bureaucrat dealing with another. He would be only another office worker, would hold no mandate from anybody, and would have none of the prestige or other influence of a Member of Congress. It would just be adding another process into the already overgrown collection of bureaus, agencies, departments, boards, committees, authorities, and other offices. Besides eliminating substantial portion of the personal contact between a Congressman and his constituents, and thereby damaging the Congressman's ability to accurately represent them, it would subject the petitioning constituent to an even longer and more annoying wait for satisfaction of his request or complaint.

I feel that the present procedure for handling congressional inquiries is both desirable and efficient. I believe it should be maintained.

Another area which has attracted my attention for the last 2½ years is that of the lack of automation in the operation of Government. It appears to be the popular conception even among the members of Congress that computers and cybernetic systems are for use only in science and technology. However, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee I submit that we are missing a great opportunity in not adapting new techniques of automation to the needs of Government.

To be sure, there has been some progress made in certain limited areas, but there has not been a comprehensive program to better utilize better programs in cybernetics for the improvement of governmental operation.

⁴ Created by H. Res. 795, on July 2, 1964.

⁵ Information provided by the Norwegian Consulate, New York City, N.Y.

tions and we have lagged too long: Not long ago we saw the first completely automated post office go into operation but with a disappointing lack of success. We must improve.

While there are still some duties which cannot be delegated to a machine, there are certainly many others of a routine nature which could be more efficiently handled through automated means. Reference work in the Library of Congress would be one area where a computerized research system would be most helpful.

Data analysis now in use by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other agencies must be considered for use in the business of Congress and its investigative functions. Committees could make great use of such analysis systems, and I would urge that an investigation of possible areas for use of modern computer methods be commenced.

A prime area for involvement of computerized administration would be the myriad and varied accounting systems employed by Government agencies and departments in regard to financial grants. I was advised by Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, in a letter dated May 11, 1965, that there is no standard auditing procedure for all of the governmental units involved in dispensing money for research.

For example, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Federal Aviation Agency use research contracts but not direct grants, while the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior use direct grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements for research. At the same time, the Departments of Defense and Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency use contracts and grants for research. However, there is no single policy which determines which research arrangements shall be audited, and which not.

While Comptroller General Campbell assures me that the "general policies and practices of the agencies in regard to the audit of their activities are for the most part under continuous review by us as an integral part of our accounting, auditing, and investigative functions," I cannot help but wonder why a uniform procedure in auditing all grants-in-aid, research contracts, and cooperative agreements is not instituted. There is no consistent treatment of these matters.

Witness, the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare have certain agencies and bureaus which do not require regular audits of research activities—that is, grants, contracts, and other agreements—on not even a selective review basis. Certain cooperative agreements for research entered into by the Agricultural Research Service, Forest Service, Economic Research Service, and Statistical Reporting Service of the Department of Agriculture do not contain auditing provisions. The Department of Interior does not have any departmentwide policy for auditing research grants, and grants by the Office of Saline Water Research are seldom audited.

It was not until June 1964 that cooperative research grants made by the Bureau of Land Management to State agricultural experiment stations included provisions for auditing the cooperators' procedures. The Bureau of Reclamation has never made an audit of a research contract, and research contracts entered into by the Welfare Administration and the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are not audited at all, save for some desk reviews in the Division of Internal Audit.

Audits are not made of Welfare Administration grants to nonprofit organizations such as hospitals, foundations, and educational institutions, the only exceptions be-

ing those grants by the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime which are audited by the Grants Audit Section of the National Institutes of Health, or the Division of Grants and Aid Audits in the office of the Secretary.

Further, the National Science Foundation is now in the process of phasing in an audit process by which Foundation grants awarded to educational institutions will be audited by the institution itself. Only a periodic review by the foundations will be made to determine the reliability of the institutions' audits.

This inexact and unsure plethora of procedures and counterprocedures, if investigated, will prove to be responsible for a great deal of waste. Periodic computer review by the appropriate congressional committees of all Federal grants and aid research contracts and cooperative agreements, I feel, would be the best solution for this problem. In addition, the formulation of a uniform accounting and auditing procedure should be required.

In relating the above-mentioned incidents of erratic auditing practices, I have used the language of the Comptroller General of the United States as he replied to my inquiries extensively. These are not the partisan figments of a Republican imagination but rather a palpable danger to whatever basis in fiscal security we have left in our Government.

Chairman MONROE, Chairman MADDEN, members of the Joint Committee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to come before you this morning. You have been very patient in listening to me and I thank you for your attention. I shall look forward with the greatest of interest and place the highest value on the report of this committee. If members of the committee have any questions which they would like to put to me at this time I would be more than happy to do my best to answer them.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. FEIGHAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TOWARD VIETNAM TALKS

(Mr. LOVE was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, during last year's presidential campaign, President Johnson several times characterized his administration's search for peace in this way:

Our guard is up—but our hand of friendship is out.

Recently, the President has said of his policy in Vietnam that he is using the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a "strong right arm" to keep the United States presence in Vietnam strong and impossible to defeat. On the other hand, the President says he is using Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Goldberg as a counterbalancing arm—charged with getting us out of Vietnam honorably through negotiations which will lead to peace and freedom for the embattled people of South Vietnam.

I think this makes sense. I congratulate the President for his strong efforts

on both fronts—the tragic and necessary war front and the uncertain but promising peace front.

I should like to offer for entry in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the New York Times of Wednesday, August 25 entitled, "Toward Vietnam Talks." This highly interesting analysis sheds light on our effort in Vietnam. An effort directed toward military success, but also toward liberty and a durable peace.

[From the New York Times, Wed., August 25, 1965]

TOWARD VIETNAM TALKS

The Johnson administration has followed the military success on Van Tuong Peninsula with a convincing demonstration of its desire for early negotiation of a Vietnamese settlement.

Secretary Rusk, Ambassador Goldberg and McGeorge Bundy, in their hour-long CBS television interview Monday night, made it clear that the Marines' extraordinary combat feat has not revived old Washington dreams of military victory. On the contrary, the entire tone of the discussion underscored Mr. Bundy's assertion "that now is a good time to negotiate."

In substance, what President Johnson's top advisers had to say was new only in bringing together many of the bits and pieces of American policy that have emerged gradually since President Johnson's April offer of "unconditional discussions." But that very process clarified the opening position the United States is taking in informal peace contacts and showed how far Washington has moved in its readiness to facilitate peace talks.

Washington and Hanoi seem to be within negotiating distance of each other now except on two significant points: Hanoi's insistence that the Vietcong represent South Vietnam at the conference table and that Saigon be excluded; and Hanoi's demand for a coalition government in South Vietnam with Communist participation, if not dominance. On the first, Washington proposes that Saigon represent South Vietnam and that the Vietcong sit in Hanoi's delegation. On the second, the United States has countered with the challenge of free elections to choose a South Vietnamese Government.

Ways undoubtedly can be found to narrow these differences once Hanoi decides, as Washington clearly has, that it too wants a negotiated settlement. The real question is whether the Van Tuong battle has moved Hanoi in this direction.

THE GREAT PUBLIC SERVICE OF W. AVERELL HARRIMAN

(Mr. JOELSON (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity of saying just a few words about Averell Harriman, whom I consider one of the most valuable public servants of our times. His modesty and unassuming manner sometime obscure the great importance of his contribution to the national interest of the United States.

Recently I attended a luncheon at which he briefed some Members of Congress, and I was tremendously impressed by him combination of idealism and imagination on the one hand and the tough practicality and realism on the other hand.

At a time in his life when many men would be staying by the fireside, Averell

August 26, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300130004-1

"5. The Committee believes that the foregoing corresponds to the terms of its instructions contained in the resolution of May 1, 1965, of the Meeting of Consultation, especially with what is stated in paragraph 2.a, concerning the cease-fire, and the content of paragraph 4, which states: [The Tenth Meeting of Consultation:] requests the American governments and the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to extend their full cooperation in order, to facilitate the work of the Committee."

After the Act of Santo Domingo was signed, by which the cease-fire of April 20, 1965, was ratified and amplified, the Special Committee sent to the Ambassador of the United States in the Dominican Republic a note in which it expressly requested the co-operation of the Government of that country in applying the stipulations of that document. The note from the Special Committee and the reply from the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, are transcribed below:

"Santo Domingo,
"May 5, 1965.

"The Honorable W. TAPLEY BENNETT,
"Ambassador of the United States of America
to the Dominican Republic, Santo Domingo
de Guzman, Dominican Republic.

"Sir: I have the honor to transmit to you, Sir, under instructions of the Special Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American States, a certified copy of the Act of Santo Domingo signed today by the parties who entitle themselves, respectively, 'military Junta of Government' and 'Constitutional Government'.

"As item 4 of the resolution of May 1, 1965, of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation requests the American Governments to extend their full cooperation in order to facilitate the work of the Committee, this Committee hopes that your Government will cooperate with it in observing the stipulations of the Act of Santo Domingo.

"Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration."

"RICARDO M. COLOMBO,
"Representative of Argentina,
"Chairman of the Committee."

WASHINGTON,
May 7, 1965.

His Excellency Dr. RICARDO M. COLOMBO,
Representative of Argentina on the Council
of the Organization of American
States.

EXCELLENCY: I have been advised by the United States Ambassador to the Dominican Republic of Your Excellency's communication to him of May 5, transmitting a certified copy of the "Act of Santo Domingo" and expressing the hope that the United States Government will cooperate in its observance. Since the Commission has now returned to Washington, I am taking the liberty of replying directly to you.

I have the honor to express my Government's gratitude for and support of the work of the Commission in Santo Domingo. The United States will cooperate fully in the observance of the provisions of the Act of Santo Domingo. I do not have before me the map attached to the Act of Santo Domingo, but I assume that the boundaries of the International Safety Zone coincide with those that now exist and that the line of communication crossing the Duarte Bridge at it now exists is shown on the map.

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration."

DEAN RUSK,
The Secretary of State.

In presenting this report to the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Special Committee has desired only to give an account of its activities from May 1 to 5, 1965, that is, during the visit to the city of Santo Domingo.

The Special Committee achieved, under truly dramatic circumstances, the main objectives set forth in the previously mentioned resolution with respect to cease-fire, the orderly evacuation of persons who have taken asylum or refuge, and humanitarian assistance to the Dominican people without any distinction as to parties or conflicting factions. The Special Committee also achieved the demarcation of a safety zone in the city of Santo Domingo in accordance with the map officially drawn up by its military advisers. This map was transmitted to both parties, and the original is at the disposal of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation.

As the representatives will note, the Act of Santo Domingo and the results thus far obtained by the Special Committee constitute the first stage of a process of restoring peace and normality in the Dominican Republic, which requires the Inter-American System to take several steps toward consolidation.

Among the measures we believe could be adopted at once by the 10th Meeting of Consultation, we suggest the following:

1. Designation of a permanent technical military group in the city of Santo Domingo to supervise the cease-fire and other measures agreed upon by the parties in the Act of Santo Domingo.

2. Designation of another qualified group to organize humanitarian aid to the Dominican people and evaluation of the most urgent needs with regard to food, medicine, and hospital equipment.

3. Study and planning of the Inter-American Force created by the Resolution of May 6, 1965, of the 10th Meeting of Consultation, in order to assure it the best conditions of operation and efficiency.

4. To empower the Special Commission to establish coordination among all these elements and activities in the Dominican Republic in order to attain the goals set forth in the resolutions approved by the 10th Meeting of Consultation.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 7, 1965.

RICARDO M. COLOMBO,
Ambassador of Argentina, Chairman.
ILMAR PENNA MARINHO,
Ambassador of Brazil.
ALFREDO VÁSQUEZ CARREROSA,
Ambassador of Colombia.
CARLOS GARCÍA BAUER,
Ambassador of Guatemala.
HUMBERTO CALAMARI G.,
Ambassador of Panama.

EXEMPTIONS FROM ANTITRUST LAWS TO ASSIST IN SAFEGUARD- ING THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair), laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8280) to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance-of-payments position of the United States, which were, on page 2, line 4, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after "payments" insert "position", and on page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendment, after "program" insert "is taken until after each voluntary agreement or program".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amend-

ment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8280).

The motion was agreed to.

THE LESS VISIBLE WAR IN VIETNAM:

Mr. JAVITS. The world and the people of South Vietnam are not at ease as they should be of our determination to wage the less visible war against poverty and despair in that country. Unfortunately much of the good work of our aid program—the basic counterinsurgency effort and the other important work on the political and economic level—has been obscured and overshadowed by the smoke of battle.

I feel that we must make sure that the people of South Vietnam themselves are aware of the fact that we are determined to aid in the fulfillment of this social revolution for their benefit, as we are to halt Vietcong military aggression; that we are determined not to allow the Communists to capture this revolution, with their hypocritical and fraudulent espousal of its objectives, only as a means of collaring a trusting people into eternal slavery.

We must underline once again our determination to help the people of South Vietnam retain their independence, and also to make that independence meaningful. We must again and again remind ourselves and the world that our military efforts are not an end in themselves, but only the means of helping the Vietnamese people to achieve their legitimate aspirations.

Press reports out of Washington the last few days indicate that there is an "air of optimism" in official thinking about the Vietnam situation. The thinking seems to be that the words of our highest officials, the deeds of the Marines on Chu Lai peninsula last week and the other actions of the U.S. Armed Forces have made it plain to the Vietcong, and their North Vietnamese and Communist Chinese supporters that we are determined not to bow to aggression. This determination, so runs this line of thinking, may well compel the Communist side to actively explore the possibility of negotiating peace.

Certainly I hope that these reports are correct and that we are closer to ending the fighting in South Vietnam. However, I feel that those who express this optimism over the situation in Vietnam are failing to take into full account the less-visible war, the legitimate social and economic revolution. As a matter of fact, to benefit from any cease fire or peace settlement, the Government of South Vietnam, working with its own citizens, and with our help, must successfully wage this war on economic and political inadequacies and failures to secure the confidence of all the Vietnamese people.

This social revolution is critically important. By propaganda, by action, and by political action the Vietcong have sought to turn this revolutionary spirit into the cutting edge of their own war against the people of South Vietnam. The highest officials of our Government

August 26, 1965

21253

have made plain our determination to aid the legitimate economic and social aspirations of the South Vietnamese people. Certainly, this determination has been underlined by the many-times valiant efforts of the 998 civilian employees of the Agency for International Development in that country; 6 of them have been killed since 1960, 3 others have been kidnapped, and 12 wounded. But by the exigencies compelled upon us, we got a late start in helping the South Vietnamese to mount a counterinsurgency effort to bring direct, practical aid to the people of the countryside, and despite many imaginative and practical programs, our response to this challenge has not yet been effective enough. There are many valid reasons why this is so, but reasons cannot get done the job that must be done; only effective action can accomplish it.

The maximum effective response to this social revolution is also required by the situation in all of southeast Asia. Our Government admits that the firmness of our determination to meet the military challenges in South Vietnam is designed, in part, to prove to the world that the United States meets its commitments. But our determination to wage effective battle at the economic, social and political levels to help the people of that nation is similarly necessary to prove to Asians and others that we are a Nation truly committed to helping other nations to become self-sufficient and capable of mastering their own destiny, free from outside interference—including ours, and that we understand their aspirations for independence.

This should be the significance of Ambassador Lodge's acceptance of the cruelly trying post of Ambassador to South Vietnam. It is the significance of his appointment of retired Maj. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale as his special assistant. In past actions and comments, both of these outstanding men have shown that they know the importance of the economic and political levels in fighting insurgency. These appointments are to be highly praised, and it is my hope that they signal a new emphasis on providing answers, as far as possible, to the basic discontent in Vietnam.

For the reasons that I have stated, I have taken a close look at the U.S. economic development and counterinsurgency efforts in South Vietnam. I have found much which is highly commendable. However, further inadequacies need correction. I have found that we and our South Vietnamese allies are successfully solving many of the age old problems of that nation, without fanfare. For example, about 80 percent of the countryside has been freed from the threat of malarial infestation—80 percent is a very important and impressive figure—and more than 9 million people have been vaccinated against cholera in joint United States-South Vietnamese efforts. We have helped to build 4,000 classrooms in the last 26 months, have aided in the construction and the stocking of 12,000 hamlet health centers, and have trained the teachers and the health workers to man them.

Of course, it is clear that the South Vietnamese people, through their duly constituted government, must carry on these programs. We can only help; we cannot stand in their place, lest we actually become guilty of the false charge of "imperialism" now hurled at us by the Communists. Accordingly, we must take the South Vietnamese Government as we find it, and do our best as advisers and friends to bring about stable and effective government without seeking to substitute ourselves as a government or to become political manipulators. This is one of the built-in limitations to what we can do in South Vietnam, and it is just as well for the American, as well as the Vietnamese people, to know it.

But even within this present context, I believe there is much more we can do that urgently needs to be done. I recommend:

First. That we materially expand the funds and the AID personnel available to carry out the counterinsurgency program which is designed to meet the immediate and most pressing needs of the people. In the 1965 fiscal year, for example, we earmarked \$65.8 million for this critical program, as compared to \$330 million under the military assistance program and \$217 million for all other AID programs, including long-range economic development and the necessary commercial import program designed to maintain the stability of the South Vietnamese economic system. Together this represents about half of the cost of our operation in Vietnam, which is running now at well over \$1 billion a year. The three figures that I have mentioned constitute about half a billion dollars.

I have pointed out that, of that half a billion dollars, only about 10 percent goes for counterinsurgency and that we should materially increase that amount.

Second. That we intensify and expand the refugee relief program in South Vietnam. It is now estimated that close to 600,000 refugees have been forced from their homes and villages since last January, largely because of an apparent step up in Vietcong tactics of terror. Whatever the reason, we have been told in the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees—presided over by the Senator from Massachusetts—that we can expect them to arrive in greater numbers. This increased flow of refugees—the most visible sign of the heartbreak of war—could critically strain the resources of the South Vietnamese Government and cause panic and grave civic discontent.

The refugee program is very serious. Certainly the refugee crisis is one area where the U.S. Government, in cooperation with South Vietnam, can provide most effective aid, since nearly 500,000 of the 600,000 refugees are now located in coastal north and north central South Vietnam.

Third. There are several specific programs, already underway or planned by AID and the Government of South Vietnam, that should be intensified and expanded.

(a) Urban housing: The influx of

refugees into Saigon and the concentration of our aid efforts in the countryside to meet the immediate threat of Vietcong activity, has worsened living conditions in Saigon and other major population centers. A survey of low-income housing needs in the Saigon area was sponsored by AID and completed last January. The Saigon government has now produced a slightly altered plan, and is considering a variety of types of construction aid offered by the United States. In fact, however, only one, small Vietnamese Government program, in Saigon, is actually under construction. This program should immediately be accelerated in the capital area, and should be made available to other coastal cities.

(b) Development of the Port of Cam Ranh Bay: Experts claim that this bay, midway between Saigon and Da Nang is the best natural harbor, next to Hong Kong, on the coast of the Asian mainland. It is now being developed as a military harbor, and extensive plans have been drawn for its eventual use as an industrial-maritime center. However, if this type of development for civilian uses were accelerated, the new port of Cam Ranh could be one of the wisest investments ever made in South Vietnam. It would inspire pride in the heart of every South Vietnamese citizen.

(c) Land reform: a positive and effective program of land reform is absolutely necessary. Political and security problems have prevented implementation of such a program, but the South Vietnamese Government has now announced its intention to move in this direction. This program must conform with the views of the peasants, must be made available to the tiller of the soil, and contain provisions for the security of tenure and for rents that are fair in relation to the productivity of the land. Since this program is considered to be crucial to the attainment of our aims in South Vietnam, appeals for quick action should be made to the Government of South Vietnam from the highest levels of our Government.

Certainly the refugee crisis is one area where the U.S. Government, in cooperation with the South Vietnamese, can provide most effective aid. Since nearly 500,000 of the 600,000 refugees are now concentrated in or near the coastal cities in central and northern South Vietnam, it would appear that we have also been presented through the terror of war with an opportunity to prove our concern and intention to help the people themselves. It has often been said that our aid efforts have not really been effective because the Vietcong control the land where the people live; that they can undo with terror what we have tried to do with agricultural, educational and health programs. But in the case of the refugees, they have come to areas which are nominally at least controlled by the Government. They have come to our side, and we should spare no effort to make sure that while they are under our protection, they are satisfactorily fed, clothed and housed and that at least minimal health and education needs are provided for.

One suggestion on the refugee program which was mentioned several times in the Refugee Subcommittee hearings concerned the more effective use of the many voluntary agencies now active in Vietnam. I will urge the subcommittee members to suggest to the administration that U.S. aircraft be used to transport supplies and personnel, provided by the U.S. voluntary agencies, from the United States to Vietnam. In this way, funds now needed for transportation will be freed for the direct benefit of the refugees.

Running through this entire discussion is the awareness of the central fact which faces our AID mission at every turn; namely, we can aid, we can advise, but we cannot replace the Vietnamese themselves. It is their country, their future, their freedom, and their show.

If one of our principal objectives is to strengthen the support of the people of South Vietnam for their own Government, it would be self-defeating to even attempt to supplant South Vietnamese officials in administering the AID program. I am convinced that there is much impatience and frustration with the administrative facilities now made available to us.

But must not our impatience and frustration be softened by the startling fact that 603 Vietnamese Government civilian officials have been killed in the performance of their duty since January 1, 1964. Another 1,431 have been kidnapped by the Vietcong. If this terror campaign occurred in the United States in the same intensity, it would mean that some 35,000 U.S. elected officials and civil servants would be killed or kidnapped in the same period of time. This should give us some sober idea of the mortal dangers faced by every conscientious South Vietnamese Government official.

The fact is that this is just one of the grave difficulties facing the effective execution of our vital aid and economic development program in South Vietnam. We are forced by the pressure of events to work in an atmosphere of war and terror in a nation of 16 million people who have been at war virtually continuously for the past quarter of a century. Is it any wonder that the bulk of the farmers in the hamlets and villages of South Vietnam are at best neutral in the struggle against the Vietcong, and at worst hostile to the South Vietnamese Government and its American allies and advisors?

This is the situation we face, and must overcome. The fact is that it can only be overcome by positive efforts on the political and economic levels. Our aid program to South Vietnam is designed to do this, and it is worthwhile pointing out some of our accomplishments in this field.

Since 1954, the Government of South Vietnam has received more than \$2.1 billion in economic aid under U.S. programs. The bulk of these funds have been used to promote long-range economic development and to provide the essential imports required by the Vietnamese economy and necessary to maintain price stability.

The remainder of AID funds have been used to directly benefit the Vietnamese people by increasing rural incomes and by providing concrete social benefits, such as schools, health clinics, and so forth.

Many of these programs have been successful and are too little known in this country. For example, a novel idea to raise food production and living standards by providing each participant with the use of American surplus corn, 3 pigs and 8 sacks of cement to construct pigsties has already put 5,000 families in the pig-raising business. This is no giveaway program. The farmers take out 8-percent loans to buy one female breeder pig and two market pigs and to pay for whatever local materials they need to complete their concrete pigsties. They buy the surplus corn on a credit basis without interest from their cooperatives, but are expected to repay when they sell their first pigs. Repayments have already started. All it costs AID is the equivalent of about \$6 per farmer to pay for the concrete. So for \$30,000 we can improve materially the conditions of 5,000 families.

Another program is designed to increase crop yields through the distribution of fertilizer by direct grant and through easy credit sales at subsidized prices. In 1964, 23,000 metric tons were granted, and another 77,000 metric tons sold through the Vietnamese National Agricultural Credit Organization and cooperatives. These amounts are in addition to about 150,000 metric tons financed under the commercial import program for regular sale, making a quarter million metric tons used in that country.

There are other successful programs designed to increase the yields of rice and to introduce new agricultural products. To take just two examples, Guatemalan Golden Flint Corn and five improved varieties of sweet potatoes have been successfully introduced in South Vietnam, and plant protection and agricultural experimentation centers have been established throughout most of the country.

One of the most impressive and productive programs has been the technical aid to fishermen. Production of fish products increased from 52,000 million ton in 1955 to 342,000 million tons in 1963 due to nylon nets, junk motorization and new methods introduced by AID. This project serves to overcome the dietary protein deficiency and reduce the consumer price of fish products in Vietnam.

Our AID personnel are also involved in many programs designed to provide immediate social benefits to the people of Vietnam. We have made impressive gains in at least two areas, education and health.

First, as to education:

In addition to the hamlet school construction program mentioned earlier, and the training of hamlet schoolteachers and the distribution of textbooks, we are helping to expand and to improve long-established teacher-training and vocational education programs. We have provided the funds for the construction of normal schools to train up to 2,100

elementary schoolteachers a year, a central polytechnical school and three secondary level polytechnical schools in the provinces. In addition, six other technical schools have been expanded and reequipped. These ten technical schools have a student capacity of 6,550. But some of the most effective activity in the education field has been in the area of trade schools institutions which can provide the majority of Vietnamese youth with the skills their nation so desperately needs. For example, we have established a system of 20 schools to provide practical training in such areas as woodworking, general mechanics, metal working, forestry, irrigation practices, and the use of basic agricultural implements to graduates of the 5-year elementary school program. In addition to construction, this project provides hand tools, laboratory equipment, teaching aids, and school furniture. Construction of 17 additional schools has been approved and 14 sites selected. Enrollment in Vietnam's rural trade schools totals over 720 students.

Second, as to health:

In the field of health, the hamlet health station is designed to show the people of South Vietnam that their government is concerned for their medical needs and is trying to meet them. This is probably the most dramatic part of a complete health program which is trying to improve standards at all levels. This program includes funds for a new medical college, nurses training courses, and the retraining of hamlet health officials; as well as vaccination and disease control projects, similar to the highly successful malaria and cholera control programs.

AID also supports a provincial hospital development program designed to improve the standards of patient care by extending the capacity for surgical services and improving the quality of medical and nursing services in selected hospitals. Nearly 6,000 operations were performed in 1964 under this program. Sixteen hospitals have been or are being renovated for the use of U.S. or other free world surgical teams, and additional surgical suites have been constructed at several other sites for a total of 26 in provincial hospitals. At present, surgical teams from the United States, New Zealand, Philippines, Australia, Italy, and Taiwan are operating in 11 different locations.

The Netherlands has an advanced party there now and South Korea has a large military hospital there now.

Mr. President, I conclude as follows:

These then are some of the concrete accomplishments of our AID program in South Vietnam. We have already discussed some of the grave disadvantages and limitations facing us in trying to help the people of that beleaguered land.

But these difficulties should not dissuade us from endeavoring to muster the spirit, resources, and imagination necessary to win the support of the people by showing, first, our concern, and then, the tangible things that the free world can do with their cooperation to improve their own situation, far outshining anything that the Communists can do.

August 26, 1965

Let us always remember that the Vietnamese people are the same people who fought with such spirit and so successfully in the name of freedom and independence to oust the French colonial administrators. Our job is to bring home to them by the substance of what we do, the contrast between our role and the terror, the rapacious taxation, and the cruel exploitation which the Vietcong are trying to disguise under the label of "national liberation." We must make clear that if the Vietcong are successful, South Vietnam would be crushed as a nation, the land of its farmers would be collectivized, and the spirit of its people broken as it would be in a prison or a garrison.

I am convinced that much can be accomplished, and that it is an objective as important to the United States as any military victory.

Mr. President, I have spoken today in order to emphasize to the American people, to the people of South Vietnam, as well as the people of all Asia, the concrete things which we have already done in fighting a less visible but equally important war—the war on poverty, the war on disease, the war on despair, the war on unjust land tenure, and the war on other difficulties which have assailed the people of Vietnam for centuries.

I feel that I speak for many millions of Americans when we pledge to the people of Vietnam that these are our real objectives, and that the military actions we are taking in their country are only a means by which these objectives may be attained, so that we may prevent the people of Vietnam from being sold into a slavery from which they may never be redeemed, and in which they will never realize or attain the legitimate objectives of their own revolution for which they have fought so long.

Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the majority leader for making this time available to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the speech of the Senator from New York was most interesting, enjoyable, and worthwhile.

I am glad that the Senator from New York had an opportunity to make the speech today, because it is on a most important subject which has been overlooked as it affects our relations with Vietnam today.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the majority leader very much.

SHOWING IN THE UNITED STATES OF U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY FILM "JOHN F. KENNEDY—YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 629, Senate Joint Resolution 106.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Ken-

nedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senate leadership for scheduling floor action today on Senate Joint Resolution 106—a resolution to permit the showing in the United States of the USIA film on the White House years of the late President Kennedy, entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." I first proposed that the Congress take such action after seeing the film at a special showing in the State Department auditorium in November 1964.

On the opening day of the current session of the Congress, I introduced an appropriate resolution for myself and 38 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Joining as cosponsors in that effort were Senators BARTLETT, BAYH, BIBLE, BREWSTER, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, DOUGLAS, ERVIN, GRUENING, HARRIS, HOLLAND, INOUE, JACKSON, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MUSKIE, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, REBICOFF, SALTONSTALL, SMATHERS, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

A similar resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 285, was subsequently introduced in the House of Representatives and passed that body on June 9 by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 311 to 75. Under the terms of that resolution the USIA was authorized to make the film available to educational and commercial media in the United States.

Senate Joint Resolution 106, the resolution before us today, authorizes USIA to transfer to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts six master copies of the film, and the exclusive rights to distribute copies thereof, through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States.

If the American people should be given an opportunity to view an excellent motion picture that is a part of the history of our Nation every American citizen is entitled to share. From all across the country, interested Americans have written to urge that the Congress authorize its domestic showing.

Wherever it has been shown abroad, the movie has been enthusiastically received. For example, the Daily Mirror of Manila described it "as a real work of art." Said the Times of India: "Each and every shot of this one and a half hour long film is so effective and heart touching that the spectators remain spellbound to the last minute." The Star of Johannesburg observed: "This film makes one want to be an American."

Bosley Crowther, noted drama critic of the New York Times, referred to it as "substantially a superior documentary that articulately and artfully combines a comprehension of the basic aims of the

murdered President and an eloquent eulogy for him." The reviewer for the Washington Post, Richard Coe, said: "This masterfully imaginative hour and a half documentary is the first full-length feature and by all odds the finest film I've seen by the U.S. Information Agency." The New York Herald Tribune reviewer, Judith Crist, describes the film as "an inspired and inspiring document, a beautiful memorial to a man who embodied so much of the American ideal and who gave voice to the American aspiration." An editorial in the Louisville (Ky.) Times stated that "it is a stirring and powerful hymn to the ideals and goals of American life."

As one who attended the first special showing for Government officials and Members of Congress at the State Department and having hosted a special viewing here on Capitol Hill for Members of Congress and their staffs, I can personally testify to the impressive quality of this film.

The film focuses on the "six faces of the New Frontier" which highlight the Kennedy years—"The Years of Lightning"—first, the Peace Corps; second, the Alliance for Progress; third, the space program; fourth, the drive for racial equality; fifth, the fight for global freedom; and, sixth, the slowing of the arms race. Interspersed throughout are stirring scenes of the late President's funeral procession—the "Day of Drums."

This motion picture is an American story, a part of our national heritage. It is the story of the American Presidency, and the ideals for which our late beloved President stood. John Kennedy's love of American history, his passion for learning, and his zest for politics gave us all a new pride in our country, and a more meaningful commitment to its service. He made us want to be better, intellectually and physically—more useful, more vigorous citizens, more actively dedicated to the peaceful development of the world and the advancement of the Nation at home.

One of President Kennedy's favorite musicals, "Camelot," ends with the words:

Don't let it be forgot that once there was a spot, for one, brief, shining moment, that was known as Camelot.

I do not think Americans will ever forget the "one, brief, shining moment" of John Kennedy's days in the White House. The mark which he has left on our history has been brilliantly captured in this USIA documentary. It is a drama which grows out of the life of the American people, and its message will have the deepest meaning for our citizens. Its domestic showing will encourage millions of Americans to rededicate themselves to the task of building a better, more just society.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve this resolution overwhelmingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was

August 26, 1965

read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. Res. 106

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the United States Information Agency entitled "Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," depicting events in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy.

It is further the sense of Congress that the expression of congressional intent embodied in this joint resolution is to be limited solely to the film referred to herein, and that nothing contained in this joint resolution should be construed to establish a precedent for making other materials prepared by the United States Information Agency available for general distribution in the United States.

SEC. 2. Accordingly, the United States Information Agency is authorized to make appropriate arrangements to transfer to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts six master copies of such film and the exclusive rights to distribute copies thereof, through educational and commercial media, for viewing within the United States. The net proceeds resulting from any such distribution shall be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and shall be available, in addition to appropriations authorized in the John F. Kennedy Center Act, to the trustees of such Center for use in carrying out the purposes of such Act.

SEC. 3. In order to reimburse the United States Government for its expenditures in connection with production of the film, such arrangements shall provide for payment, at the time of delivery of the said master copies, for such rights in the amount of \$122,000, which shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. Any documentary film which has been, is now being, or is hereafter produced by any Government department or agency with appropriations out of the Treasury concerning the life, character, and public service of any individual who has served or is serving the Government of the United States in any official capacity shall not be distributed or shown in public in this country during the lifetime of the said official or after the death of such official unless authorized by law in each specific case.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 647), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to see the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) and entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." It authorizes USIA to transfer to the trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts six master copies of the film, and the exclusive rights to dis-

tribute copies thereof, through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States. The resolution requires that at the time of delivery of these master copies of the film, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will pay the Treasury \$122,000 to reimburse the U.S. Government for its costs in producing the film. The resolution further provides that the net proceeds resulting from the distribution of the film by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the Center and will be available to the trustees of the Center for use in carrying out the purpose of the act authorizing the Center. Finally, the resolution provides that any documentary film which has been, is now being or is hereafter produced by any Government department or agency with appropriations out of the Treasury concerning the life, character, and public service of any individual who has served or is serving in any official U.S. Government capacity will not be distributed or shown in the United States unless authorized by specific law.

BACKGROUND

After the assassination of the late President John F. Kennedy, USIA produced a color motion picture entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums." The film was released in the fall of 1964 and has been distributed in 117 foreign countries. USIA has also distributed, or is in the process of preparing for distribution, translations of the film in 29 foreign languages. According to press reports, and the reports of U.S. representatives abroad, the film has been received enthusiastically by foreign audiences.

Section 501 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, (Public Law 80-402) provides that the output of USIA shall be made available for examination by Members of Congress as well as by representatives of the press and of other communications media. This provision was included in the law in order to assure that the output of USIA would be subject at all times to scrutiny by responsible persons outside the Agency. Under this provision, the film has been shown to a limited number of people within the United States. The film has also been shown in Boston, Mass., at the dedication of the Boston Civic Memorial Center on February 22, 1965, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 282, and in Cambridge, Mass., at the 25th class reunion of the Harvard class of 1940, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 426.

It has not, however, been shown to the public at large in the United States. Section 2 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, states, that USIA is "to disseminate abroad information about the United States, its people, and policies."

Section 501 of the same act contains similar language limiting USIA's activities to disseminating information about the United States abroad. It was clearly the intent of Congress when the act was passed, an intent that has been reaffirmed frequently since, that USIA should not disseminate information domestically.

COMMITTEE ACTION

At executive sessions on March 3 and 16, 1965, the committee considered three resolutions relating to the showing of the film in the United States. These resolutions were Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which had been introduced in the Senate on January 6, 1965, by Mr. McGovern; Senate Joint Resolution 8 which had been introduced in the Senate by Mr. PELL also on January 6, 1965; and House Concurrent Resolution 285 which had been introduced in the House on Feb-

ruary 10, 1965, passed by the House by a vote of 311 to 75 on June 9, 1965 and placed on the Senate Calendar on June 10, 1965.

All three of these resolutions expressed the sense of the Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film, and that USIA should make appropriate arrangements to make the film available for distribution through educational and commercial media for viewing within the United States. Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 also provided that the net proceeds resulting from showing the film would be contributed to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Senate Joint Resolution 3 provided that these proceeds would be covered into the Treasury for the benefit of the Center. House Concurrent Resolution 285 made no mention of the disposition to be made of the proceeds resulting from showing the film. The committee reached no decision on these resolutions at the two executive sessions in March.

The committee met again in executive session on August 24 to consider House Concurrent Resolution 285. While the committee decided that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to see the film, the committee considered it important that it be made clear that no precedent would be established which might encourage USIA to turn from its assigned task of conducting information activities abroad to disseminating information at its discretion in the United States. The committee also decided that the commercial distribution of the film in the United States should be taken out of the hands of USIA; that the net proceeds resulting from showing the film in the United States should be made available to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; and that the Center should pay \$122,000 for six master copies of the film, and the exclusive rights to distribute copies thereof within the United States, in order to reimburse the U.S. Government for its expenditures in producing the film. In addition, the committee concluded that the authority to allow the showing of the film in the United States under the conditions described above should be by joint resolution having the force and authority of law rather than by House Concurrent Resolution 285 which would merely express the sense of the Congress. It thus decided not to recommend favorably House Concurrent Resolution 285 and to report in its place an original Senate joint resolution.

The committee agreed that there should be no partisan political consideration in the arrangements made for distributing the film in the United States and that there should be no showing of the film, as at a political convention for example, which would serve a partisan political purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 628, House Concurrent Resolution 285 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted with the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 106, allowing the showing in the United States of the USIA film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Days of Drums," the wonderful film concerning the life and death of the administration of our late beloved President Kennedy. The people of our own State of Rhode Island, which always had a particular affection for President Kennedy, will be particularly glad when the time comes that they can view this film.

I salute, too, those who made this film, which is truly an excellent one.